UNION SEMINARY QUARTERLY REVIEW

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

VOLUME XII, NUMBER 2 JANUARY 1957

BAILLIE
SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE CHANGING THEOLOGICAL SCENE

READ
THE OLD TESTAMENT AND MODERN PREACHING

DIAMOND
MARTIN BUBER AND CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY

BENNETT
THE FACULTY RE-EXAMINES ITS WORK

LOOMIS
PSYCHIATRY AND THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

GOOD
WHO IS WORTHY?

BOYD
THE WEB AND THE CROSS

BOOK REVIEWS

UNION SEMINARY QUARTERLY REVIEW

TO PROMOTE THOUGHT AND ACTION IN THE SERVICE OF CHRIST

VOLUME XII, NUMBER 2 JANUARY 1957

EDITOR

WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

JOHN F. WILSON

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

SWAIN H. LOY

BUSINESSS AND
CIRCULATION MANAGER

RONALD V. PERRIN

EDITORIAL STAFF

JOHN CANNON, JOHN CATO, JEAN DUNCAN, ERNEST GEIGIS,
ROBERT HUDNUT, DAN KENNEDY, MATTHEW PERRY
ROBERT WRIGHT

FACULTY ADVISERS

Editorial, ROBERT T. HANDY; *Book Reviews*, ROBERT F. BEACH;
Financial, RANDOLPH H. DYER; *Alumni*, EDWIN O. KENNEDY

Published by the students, faculty, and alumni of Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York, in November, January, March, and May.

Copyright 1957 by Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York

Subscription rate: $1.00 per year, 35 cents per copy.

Contents

Some Reflections on the Changing Theological Scene 3

JOHN BAILLIE *delivered this address in James Memorial Chapel on October* 24, 1956, *when he was inducted as the Harry Emerson Fosdick Visiting Professor. Dr. Baillie describes some of the changes in the theological climate which have transpired since he first came to Union, and suggests the path which future thought should take.*

The Old Testament and Modern Preaching 11

DAVID H. C. READ, *Minister of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, discusses the true principle of unity in Scripture and its implications for modern preaching.*

Martin Buber and Contemporary Theology 17

MALCOLM DIAMOND *wrote his Ph.D. dissertation on Martin Buber for Columbia and Union last year, and is now a member of the Department of Religion at Princeton University. This article is the second in a series of four dealing with prominent modern theologians and their contributions to contemporary Christian thought.*

The Faculty Re-examines Its Work 25

JOHN C. BENNETT, *Dean of the Faculty and Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics, reports on a series of faculty discussions dealing with the nature and purpose of theological education and examining the faculty's own work in the light of these considerations.*

Psychiatry and the Christian Ministry 31

EARL A. LOOMIS, JR., *M.D., Professor of Psychiatry and Religion and Director of the Program in Religion and Psychiatry, states the issues growing from the increasing interaction between psychiatry and religion today, and suggests seven possible modes of relating them to each other. This article is based on an address Dr. Loomis delivered at Union to a group of ministers on July* 17, 1956.

Who Is Worthy? 41

EDWIN M. GOOD *is Assistant Professor of Religion in Stanford University. He preached this sermon in James Memorial Chapel on May* 25, 1956.

The Web and The Cross 45

MALCOLM BOYD, *former producer, writer and publicist, and now an ordained Episcopalian clergyman, is a Tutor Assistant at Union. Author of the forthcoming book* CRISIS IN COMMUNICATION: A CHRISTIAN EXAMINATION OF THE MASS MEDIA, *he analyzes the challenge with which mass media confront the Church in its task of communicating the Gospel.*

Book Reviews 51

In Memoriam

On the twenty-eighth of December, Swain Hughes Loy and his younger sister Suzanne were accidentally drowned in Roanoke Rapids Lake near Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, when the boat in which they were sailing capsized. They are survived by their parents, Mr. and Mrs. H. S. Loy, and by Swain's wife, Mrs. Betty Loy. A memorial service for Swain was held in James Memorial Chapel on Wednesday, the ninth of January.

Swain, who was twenty-three years old, came to Union from Davidson College with his wife, whom he married in August, 1955. A Presbyterian, he worked at the Fort George Presbyterian Church in upper Manhattan during his first year at Seminary, and this past semester, assisted as a technician in the Seminary's Audio-Visual Department, where Betty is a secretary. He also served as Associate Editor of the *Quarterly Review*.

Those who knew Swain liked him, and loved him, and will not forget him. Our memory of him is indelible, our loss is irreparable. We will remember his ability to laugh at himself, and the sense of humor which he possessed in redemptive abundance. We will remember the warmth of his personality, and his sincere and selfless concern for others whom he could help. We will remember the hours he spent talking with us about our common faith, our common doubts, and our common hopes. We will remember his independence, his tolerance, and his dedication. And we will be the better for these memories, and for having known him. We pray that, in the mystery of God's loving providence, he who has gone before us has found rest and peace.

We gratefully dedicate this page and this issue to Swain, our friend and our fellow-worker. And to his wife and parents, we extend our deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Some Reflections on the Changing Theological Scene

John Baillie

Just thirty-seven years ago I was inducted into the chair of systematic theology in Auburn Seminary, and just twenty-six years ago—after a short interval of service in Canada—I was inducted into a similar chair in Union Seminary. You may therefore find it not altogether unprofitable if I offer a few very informal reflections on some of the changes that have overtaken the theological scene during the intervening period; and if I should seem to be speaking mainly of how these changes have affected my own thinking, I hope you will excuse the personal references that are thus involved.

Modernism vs. Fundamentalism

When I came to America immediately after the close of the First World War in 1919, the most lively theological debate was on the issue between what were called modernism and fundamentalism. I was always being asked to which of these parties I belonged, but I found myself at a loss for an answer. I had scant enough sympathy with the fundamentalists, yet I found myself very ill at ease with those who were most eager to proclaim themselves as modernists. The fundamentalists thought of themselves as defending the tradition of their Puritan forefathers, and so in a sense they were, but their defense was inevitably tempered very differently from the original formation of that tradition. The Puritans might be said to have been naive fundamentalists, because up to that time the plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture and the reliability of Biblical history had never been challenged. But in endeavoring to occupy the self-same position, the fundamentalists of 1919 were belligerently repudiating the whole development of modern documentary criticism and scientific historiography which had grown up in the interven-

ing period, and I had no doubt at all in my mind that in doing this they were defending a lost cause. The modernists on the other hand seemed to me to be using their new-found freedom in order to read their own very nineteenth-century predilections and philosophy of life into the Biblical teaching, and thus to be corrupting the true and original Christian message. I can indeed now see that I myself often fell victim to this mistake, standing badly in need of the corrective influences which were soon to emerge and of which I shall be speaking in a moment. Yet even in those days my polemic was almost always directed against those who sat more loosely than I to the traditional theology, and very seldom against those who were more conservatively-minded—though that may have been largely due to the fact that fundamentalism was very little represented among the students whom I taught or in the circles in which I happened to move.

The Barthian Movement

When I had been in America for a little more than ten years a new situation began to declare itself—I think about the winter of 1930-31. This was when the impact of what I shall call the Barthian movement was first felt on this side of the Atlantic. But when I speak of the Barthian movement, I am not thinking only of Dr. Barth's own writings, but of a much wider stirring of the waters which threw up Dr. Barth as its most distinguished spokesman. The change was overdue and would have come about had there been no Dr. Barth, but it would have proceeded more slowly and confusedly. It was late in reaching America. There was a current saying, when I was a student in Germany before the First War, that "Bad German philosophers, when they die, go to Oxford." Perhaps the same has been true, not only of some good German philosophers, but also of some German theologians both good and bad; and perhaps it is also true that some of them, after a further short delay in Oxford and Edinburgh, enjoy a second re-incarnation in America! It so happened that, I think in the year 1933, it was my turn to read a paper at a social meeting of the Faculty of Union Seminary, and I called my paper "A Preface to Barthianism." I was not indeed anything that could be called a Barthian myself, but there were those among my colleagues who could see no significance at all in the movement, and I was bold enough to think that I understood something of what it portended. My thesis was that what was here happening in theology must be taken very seriously, because it was closely parallel to what was at the same time happening in many other fields, and especially in poetry and *belles lettres*, in painting, sculpture, architecture and music. I remember saying that, if we understood just how and why Victorian poetry had given way to

such poetry as Mr. Eliot's *The Wasteland*, Victorian fiction to such novels as James Joyce's *Ulysses* and Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu*, the painting of Landseer and Sir John Millar's to that of Picasso and Paul Klee, and so forth, we should better understand how and why Dr. Barth and so many others of his generation were in revolt against the teaching to which he and I were together subjected in the German universities in our student days. What was happening in all these fields was a turning back of modern thought upon itself, an attempt to undo much of the thinking that had been done since the period of the Renaissance, and the true tendency of which had most clearly revealed itself in the forms it finally assumed in the second half of the nineteenth century with some overspilling into the early years of the twentieth.

Dr. Barth was no fundamentalist. Some find a certain encroachment of fundamentalism in his later writings, but this could not be said of his earlier books. He had no quarrel at all with the documentary criticism of the Bible, even as practised by the most advanced critics. Furthermore, he would have nothing to do with the traditional apologetic which sought to stop what Calvin had called "the obstreporous mouths of unbelievers" by forcing them, for instance, to admit the historicity of the Gospel miracles and our Lord's resurrection. And he followed Kant and Ritschl in his angry denial of the validity of natural theology. In all this he was, and is, still a child of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, so that the true fundamentalist will have nothing to do with him. The fundamentalists of our small Scottish Free Church—the so-called "Wee Frees"—have often been at pains to repudiate him and all his works.

But in his interpretation of the Christian faith, in his teaching about God, the world and man, Dr. Barth was anxious that we should retrace our steps to a point behind the Enlightenment and even behind the Renaissance. He submitted that we had nothing to learn from the intermediate period. The true line of theological advance, he believed, did not pass *through* the thought of that period, but rather *around* it. Some twenty years ago Dr. Visser't Hooft, who I suppose may be called a Barthian, wrote that in our day Luther and Calvin, St. Thomas Aquinas and the seventeenth-century Anglican theologians have risen from their graves and resumed their interrupted conversations[1]. To which, incidentally, Professor Leonard Hodgson replied that in that case he would "ask these risen giants to enter into the full heritage of the age in which they have come to life again, and not to bid us listen to the conversation of a group of Rip van Winkles."[2]

---

[1] *Oecumenica*, Vol. ii, No. 3 (London, October 1935), p. 243.
[2] *The Grace of God in Faith and Philosophy*, London 1936, p. 179.

The Illusion of Finality

Now I am quite sure that we have all learned a very great deal from Dr. Barth and have much more still to learn from him; and not only from him but from the whole turn of the tide which we symbolize by using his name—from the widespread reaction against the nineteenth-century version of liberalism, from the resurgence of Calvinism, from the rediscovery of Luther, and from much that in recent years has gone under the name of Biblical Theology. So much that was written in the earlier decades of this century now seems lamentably thin and hopelessly out of date—unreadable in fact. Even if we find ourselves unable to accept much of what is taught in those newer schools of thought, we must admit that they have made us think again. They have shifted the whole theological situation onto different ground. Even if we wish to re-assert our former opinions, they have forced us to re-state them.

I suppose that in the heyday of the former liberalism most of its protagonists suffered from what I should call the illusion of finality. They were too much inclined to assume like Job's friends that they were the people and wisdom would die with them (Job 12:2), too ready to suppose that the development of theological thought would come to rest in the position which they represented. But has not the same illusion beset the spokesmen of the succeeding movement? They are even more dogmatically entrenched in their new position than was the former generation in the old. This has something to do with the spirit of the age, with its strong temptation to take refuge in totalitarian authority. It is symptomatic that Dr. Barth is often gentle in dealing with those who are altogether outside his camp, but ruthless towards deviationists. You must either toe the line or begone to you. And I have found something of the same dogmatic temper, the same *odium theologicum,* in the spokesmen of the other schools which have contributed to the same general movement. It is a temper which I greatly regret, but not least because it helps to nourish the illusion of finality.

Post-Barthian Theology

I myself have always felt that a further reaction was bound to set in sooner or later. Only at one's peril can one indeed forecast the future development of thought, but judging from the course which thought has always followed in the past, I have thought it more than likely that—we cannot say how soon, whether within ten or twenty or fifty or a hundred years— there would develop a post-Barthian theology, just as Dr. Barth himself did so much for the development of a post-liberal theology. Judging again from the past history of thought, I have always believed

that this new movement would bend towards the recovery of some of the positions which Dr. Barth has surrended and yet never come near to a rebuilding of these in their entirety. Those who wish to go forward from Barthianism must beware of repeating what I believe to be its own characteristic error. It tried to reach its position by going round the thought of the Enlightenment instead of through it, and then beyond it. But I believe any effective and significant post-Barthian movement must go *through* Barthianism, not repudiating the remarkable contribution which it has made to all our thinking but entering fully into its heritage, while at the same time correcting its deficiencies and also recovering for us much that was of value in those earlier ways of thought which were too brashly jettisoned.

Bultmann

There are already signs of such a movement, though it is still too early to say how significant these signs may turn out to be. No doubt one thinks first of Dr. Bultmann and his programme of demythologising. When I first knew Dr. Bultmann he talked nothing but Barthianism to me, and with him the word "liberalism" was nothing but a term of abuse; nor is there any doubt that, whether or not we can still call him a Barthian, his present mind bears every mark of having passed through the Barthian waters—or should I say fires? Dr. Barth himself, in his little book entitled *Rudolf Bultmann: An Attempt to Understand Him*, clearly regards the demythologising movement as a new outbreak of the liberalism he himself discarded, and manifests some apprehension that the rising theological generation may be won over to it in reaction against his own teaching. "Nobody yet knows," he writes, "whether Bultmann's undertaking will be determinative for the theology of the second half of the century." It is not yet settled in heaven, he says, but he fears that it may be so, "if only because the rising generation have had no personal acquaintance with Egypt, that land of bondage, the era of Ritschl, Harnack and Troeltsch and their predecessors, and are perhaps no longer able to understand the significance of our own exodus from it." But he hopes that if they do desire to return to the fleshpots of Egypt, they will not forget how quickly the Israelites grew tired of the manna and how they suffered from the quails that were there sent to them; and hopes too that our own new generation will not be punished by *too many* quails! Certainly it is true that many of the theological students and younger pastors and teachers in Germany are now following Dr. Bultmann rather than Dr. Barth, and in Scotland also the demythologising movement has made no small impact—whether for better or for worse.

Bonhoeffer

Significant indications of a movement towards a post-Barthian position are also present in the posthumously-published fragmentary writings of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer was my student in this Seminary in 1930-31, and was then the most convinced disciple of Dr. Barth that had appeared among us up to that time, and withal as stout an opponent of liberalism as had ever come my way. But in later years, and especially as he lay in Hitler's prison for more than two years prior to his execution, his thinking began to move forward. His immense debt to Dr. Barth is still fully manifest, and also fully acknowledged by him. He does not desire to go back on the Barthian movement, but to go forward from it. Yet in going forward from it, he is much more fully aware than is Dr. Barth of the debt we also owe to liberalism. The effect, he says, of this lack of awareness is that Dr. Barth has replaced the positivism of the old liberalism by a "positivism of revelation," which says "Take it or leave it" (*Iss, Vogel, oder stirb*)—a positivism which would force us to swallow the tradition whole or not at all. In a sense Bonhoeffer also accepts the tradition as a whole, but he does so with a difference, because he finds it to be in need of interpretation. He seeks to interpret it in what he calls "a non-religious sense." That way of speaking has puzzled many of his readers, but I would refer you for an explanation of it to the recent book of Ronald Gregor Smith, *The New Man* with the sub-title *Christianity and Man's Coming of Age.* Here also lies the difference between Bonhoeffer's and Dr. Bultmann's way of seeking to go beyond Dr. Barth's limitations. Dr. Bultmann seeks to disengage what he calls the mythological elements in the Christian tradition from its essential core, but to Bonhoeffer that is to relapse into the typical reduction process of the old liberalism. For him the whole tradition is of a single piece. It is all, if you like, mythological, or at least it is symbolism; but it all hangs together and is all highly significant: only it needs to be reinterpreted in the light of "man's coming of age"—in the light of the new insight deriving from the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. "We must," he says, "move out again into the open air of discussion with the world"—and that means the modern world, the world in which we are all now living.

Tillich

It seems to me also that the notable contribution made to our theological thinking by your own Dr. Tillich has been of this same general kind. Like the others of whom I have spoken, he has led us through the insights of Barthianism to something that goes beyond it. While sharing from the beginning in the reaction against the old liberalism, Dr. Tillich

has never surrendered the gains of the *Aufklarung*. Unlike the Barthians, he is deeply engaged with philosophy. The Barthians, as we all know, will have nothing to do with philosophy. They ignore all that is being thought and written by the philosophers at the present time, and this is all the more unfortunate because our British philosophers at least are now asking theological questions all the time. They are all the time challenging the theologians to answer their very penetrating questions. But they get no satisfying answer, and most often they get no answer at all. I am sure this is a very great mistake, and one of the things I most hope for from our rising generation of theologians is that they should enter deeply into conversation with those who are now teaching philosophy in our universities, accepting their challenge and offering a cogent answer to their questions. In his recent volume *Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality*, Dr. Tillich thus expresses the challenge he is attempting to answer:

> Is not the very nature of biblical religion opposed to philosophy? Does not biblical religion destroy the strongholds of human thought by the power of the divine revelation to which it gives witness? Was not the great theological event of the last decades Karl Barth's prophetic protest against the synthesis between Christianity and humanism? Did not Barth reinterpret for our time the radical dissonation of Christianity and philosophy found in Kierkegaard a century ago? Is not the conviction that the advancement and the application of the gospel are served in the attempt to relate philosophy and the gospel an unfortunate return to the theological situation at the turn of the century? (p. 1-2).

Such then, as it seems to me, has been the general course followed by the development of theological thought since I first began to teach the subject; and such the situation which is now beginning to emerge. I find it not only an exciting but also a most promising situation, and I look forward to the coming years with great confidence and hope.

His most recent book . . .

PAUL HUTCHINSON

late editor of The Christian Century

THE NEW ORDEAL OF CHRISTIANITY

A discerning, scholarly analysis of the Christian plight and promise in the world today . . . the church's internecine conflicts, its struggles with hostile faiths and states. *Ready in March.* **$2.50**

An official study book for the Interseminary Movement

ROBERT W. SPIKE

IN BUT NOT OF THE WORLD

A Notebook of Theology and Practice in the Local Church

How closely are churches adhering to Jesus' teachings? Are they conforming to the world, or conforming the world to Christ? A frank appraisal with positive suggestions.

Ready in March. **$2.00**

REFLECTION BOOKS

"Creative enterprise . . . significant books." — REINHOLD NIEBUHR

An exciting new series of low-priced paperback books, written by leading churchmen, religious historians, editors for the average churchgoer. Distinguished by their clarity, writing style, authority, variety of content, and application of beliefs.

RELIGIOUS LIVING (rev. ed.)
Georgia Harkness

WHAT CHRISTIANITY SAYS ABOUT SEX, LOVE AND MARRIAGE
Roland H. Bainton

BASIC CHRISTIAN WRITINGS
Stanley I. Stuber, *editor*

A SHORT PRIMER FOR PROTESTANTS
James Hastings Nichols

WORDS TO CHANGE LIVES
Abridgements of great sermons by 58 ministers

THE LIFE OF CHRIST IN POETRY
Hazel Davis Clark, *editor*

Ready in March **50c each 12 for $5**

WORLD CHRISTIAN BOOKS

for group study
for individual use

A. J. APPASAMY, ed., The Cross Is Heaven: Life and Writings of Sundar Singh
GEORGE APPLETON, John's Witness to Jesus
V. S. AZARIAH, Christian Giving
JOHN C. BENNETT, The Christian as Citizen
JOHN FOSTER, Beginning from Jerusalem
EDUARD LOHSE, Mark's Witness to Jesus Christ
EDWARD A. MAYCOCK, A Letter of Wise Counsel: Studies in the First Epistle of Peter
JAMES MARTIN, Did Jesus Rise from the Dead?
GIOVANNI MIEGGE, Religious Liberty
PAUL MINEAR, Jesus and His People
STEPHEN C. NEILL, The Christian Character
—, The Christians' God
—, Who Is Jesus Christ?
DANIEL T. NILES, Reading the Bible Today
CHARLES E. RAVEN, Christianity and Science
LAKSHMIBAI TILAK, From Brahma to Christ

$1.25 each

ASSOCIATION PRESS ● 291 BROADWAY ● N. Y. C. 7

The Old Testament and Modern Preaching

David H. C. Read

One of the fruits of modern ecumenical theology which does not yet seem to have fallen securely into the lap of the average parish minister is the rediscovery of the unity of the Bible. The period of disintegration which succeeded the first wave of Biblical criticism still seems to affect the preaching of the church in spite of the vast work of reintegration in which modern scholarship has been engaged. In simpler terms: much preaching is still being done on the assumption that the Old Testament is related to the New simply as literary and historical background, and the unity of the Bible as the Word of God is experienced by neither preacher nor congregation.

Now that we are discovering how it is possible to preach with authority and proclaim the Word without accepting any literal or mechanical theory of Biblical inspiration, it is time that we also learned how to use the Old Testament again in the pulpit. I believe that God can speak to this generation through the Law and the Prophets, and that we can proclaim this Word without sacrificing either the note of authority or our integrity as the heirs of a hundred years of massive and devoted Old Testament scholarship. It is not easy, but under God it can and must be done.

Everyone will agree that there is an almost unprecedented ignorance of the contents of the Old Testament in our modern churches. This is the result not only of a hesitancy on the part of ministers to deal with the great areas of Old Testament history and prophecy which seem, when understood in their historical context, to have little relevance to the affairs of the modern worship, but also of the persisting influence of a theology centered exclusively on the "teaching of Jesus." Our church people have been left with the impression that the history and religion of Israel are a somewhat embarrassing legacy which ministers use with timidity and reserve. This impression has been accentuated by the un-

fortunate liturgical (or rather, non-liturgical) development by which the reading of an Old Testament lesson has come to be omitted from public worship. Another paper could easily be written on the disastrous results of liturgical changes which are based on non-theological prejudices; and the omission of an Old Testament reading is symptomatic of the tendency to eliminate the objective factors of Word and Creed in favor of a subjective piety or, at its worst, a ministerial "cult of personality."

The selection of suitable Old Testament readings, we must frankly confess, brings us up against some of the real difficulties of our subject; for it is the experience of most of us that out of the vast available material, comparatively few extracts commend themselves as possible either in length or suitability for public reading in our worship. One exit from this difficulty is a lectionary, but a weekly, as compared with a daily, lectionary has obvious disadvantages; and most preachers feel the necessity of having the Scripture readings related to the theme of the sermon. Those who thus make their own selection will find that they are inevitably operating with a canon within the Canon, tending to return continually to certain favorite passages. This, however, ought not to deter us from a constant use of Old Testament readings provided that our selection is sufficiently representative of the range and variety of the Old Testament documents. This problem of Old Testament readings highlights for us the problem of its preaching. There are certain obvious texts which leap to the eye from the better known pages of the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms, and about them there is little difficulty; but what are we to do with great tracts of law and history which seems exclusively Jewish? The pages of the prophets which are obscure to all but the expert (and are often more obscure when he has finished with them!), the abundance of stories whose surface moral strikes the fair-minded reader as sub-Christian, the bulk of the ceremonial law, the genealogical detail—these are the problem-pieces of the Old Testament for the modern preacher. The man who sees no problem here is the man who, however much he professes to accept the whole Bible as the Word of God, has never really studied it as a whole—or else has found some "key" which he is able to twist into almost any lock.

The True Principle of Scriptural Unity

What we need to discover is the true principle of unity in the Scriptures. Without it we are forced simply to treat the Old Testament as historical background for the Gospel, or as a source-book for the occasional text of national or personal devotion.

That principle can be none other than the Gospel itself. The Church, from the beginning, has lived by the assertion that "Jesus Christ is Lord."

Every word of that confession relates to the conviction that the God who is Creator and Sovereign over all mankind disclosed himself at a specific and concrete point in time and space for the reconciliation and rescue of the human race. Something happened in history. The Gospel is thus anchored in an historical act of God. The Church does not proclaim simply some kind of timeless truth, but rather that such a timeless truth as "God *is* love" is guaranteed to us because "God so loved the world that he *gave* his only-begotten Son." This "giving" was real, factual, and concrete. In other words, Jesus Christ can be dated and located in the human story.

We know that this historical fact has been realized for us in the Church which is His Body. If we are Christians today it is not simply because the Spirit of God has revealed Christ to us, but because the Church has existed concretely in history since Pentecost. Therefore it should not be difficult for us to understand that there should have been also historical *antecedents* for the coming of Christ. God acted in Christ—and the Church is the result of that action; God acted in Christ—and the story of Israel is the prelude to that action. Both the Church and Israel are historical facts related to the central event when "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." We are therefore in a position to understand that the story of Israel—the people of God—is directly related to the story of the "new Israel" which is the Christian Church. The one came before, and the other after, the disclosure that "Jesus Christ is Lord." If the Church is the contemporary human witness to the divine Event, the story of Israel is the equally human witness to its preparation. None of the words by which the New Testament witnesses to the unique action of God in Christ can really be understood without reference to what went before.

The authority, then, of the New Testament rests finally upon the fact that these documents are the *only* authentic witness to the impact of Christ in this world; and the authority of the Old Testament upon the fact that it is the *only* authentic witness to the historical preparation for the Gospel. If the Gospel were simply an announcement about God's nature or purpose, the Old Testament could be relegated to the position of necessary background reading. But since the Gospel is an announcement of an Event—an action of God at a specific time and through a particular Person—the record of the preparation for that Event assumes a divine authority.

Implications of This Unity for Preaching

What should this recognition of the unity of the Bible as the record of a unique action of God in history mean for our preaching?

(1)

It should mean, in the first place, a frank acceptance of the record in its historical context. As God revealed himself centrally in a *man,* we must be content with a human record of the preparatory history of Israel. All attempts to "spiritualize" the story are a kind of docetism. The heresy that made our Lord only "appear" man is reflected in the preaching that makes the Old Testament only "appear" to deal with real people.

This is the peril of all allegorical treatment of the Old Testament. Granted that we may legitimately in our preaching from time to time make Old Testament stories into symbols of a personal contemporary situation, we are never really at liberty to evade the historical problems —to leave the impression that "this did not really happen." (I am referring, of course, to the frankly historical records: the Old Testament also includes, as every truly human literature does, examples of poetry, legend, and drama.) We may, if we like, move directly from the Exodus to the parallel of our Redemption; or from the prophet's word to an Israel in captivity to the Atonement; but we must not omit the factual reference. We should be no more hesitant of proclaiming that God acted through Moses and Isaiah than through Peter and Paul. And we need be no more squeamish about confessing the incompleteness and inadequacy of the earlier interpretations of events than we are of declaring that "Jesus *increased* in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man."

A modern congregation can be thrilled and exalted by the factual recounting of Old Testament events, but can be bored beyond endurance by laborious allegorizing. To "find Christ" in the Old Testament it is not necessary to seek what used to be called "types." It is above all necessary to demonstrate the God who is seeking "a people for himself." What matters is not so much the "idea of God" that has been reached at a certain stage in Israel's history as the continual revelation of the relationship of trust and obedience that God requires in a concrete human situation.

(2)

A new understanding of the unity of the Bible should lead us to relate the Old Testament texts to the Gospel of Christ. We must, however, be clear what this does *not* mean. It does not mean the exegetical contortions by which incidents from Israel's history have been made to yield allegorical reference to every aspect of the Gospel. Nor does it mean an excessive use of allegory by which the factual nature of the narrative is destroyed. It means rather that in all our preaching it will become apparent that we are dealing with a *continuous* story—an action of God in history that culminates in Christ. There is no part of the Old Testament that thus becomes irrelevant, for we shall be treating it in its living con-

text. This method of using the Old Testament in our preaching depends upon our conviction that the central proclamation of the Gospel—the *kerygma*—is the authority which gives life to the entire Canon. It depends also upon a continuous and habitual practice of this type of preaching so that our congregation becomes aware of this Biblical unity. After a while it will not be necessary to make continual and laborious explanations about the so-called primitive strata in the tradition.

(3)

There is, of course, another factor emerging from our conception of Biblical unity which cannot be disregarded. This was called in Reformation theology the "testimony of the Holy Spirit." A renewed understanding of this truth will prevent our conceiving of Biblical unity in purely historical terms. In practice it means, as every minister knows, that texts from the Old Testament, as well as New, spring to life in the contemporary situation. This dynamic quality of the Word is not within our control as preachers, but no one who is aware of the Holy Spirit as God "here and now" can have failed to have experienced this dynamism of the Biblical text.

I am aware that this article leaves many problems unsolved and perhaps even raises some new ones! This is not an attempt to provide detailed practical guidance but to stimulate thought on a vital subject in the life of the modern church. Controversy on the use of the Old Testament can be good: agreement would be better: the indifference from which we are emerging could have been fatal.

The First Two Books of the Significant Series on Theological Education in America

THE PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH AND ITS MINISTRY

By H. RICHARD NIEBUHR. This book presents a vital new conception of the ministry. It gives a challenging definition of the true church and foresees a theological school which will serve the enlarged view of the ministry, the church and the community. "Important enough quite by itself to justify its earliest possible circulation in the whole church."—*Christian Century.* $2.00

THE MINISTRY IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

***Edited by* H. RICHARD NIEBUHR and DANIEL P. WILLIAMS.** Eight outstanding American church historians comment penetratingly on nine great epochs in the history of the ministry and what they mean to the church today. Contributors include John Knox, George Williams, Roland Bainton, Wilhelm Pauck, Edward Hardy, Winthrop Hudson, Sidney Mead and Robert Michaelsen. *Just published.* $3.75

PROPHECY AND RELIGION IN ANCIENT CHINA AND ISRAEL

By H. H. ROWLEY, *author of* THE RELEVANCE OF APOCALYPTIC, etc. A noted Old Testament scholar throws new light on the similarities of the prophetic in two major religious systems. He discusses the similar sayings of Chinese sages and their prophet-contemporaries in Israel, and offers a valuable study in comparative religions as well as a rewarding introduction to East-West philosophies. $2.75

At your bookseller

HARPER & BROTHERS . . . NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

Martin Buber and Contemporary Theology

Malcolm Diamond

In the spring of 1957, in his seventy-ninth year, Martin Buber will come to this country from Israel to give a series of lectures at the Washington School of Psychiatry. These lectures to a professional group of psychiatrists will deal with the relation between philosophy and psychology. Yet Buber, whose philosophy of "I and Thou" has influenced so many intellectual disciplines, is primarily a religious thinker. His influence on contemporary religion has also been wide-ranging, and Professor John C. Bennett has observed that "it is remarkable that the greatest living Jewish thinker should also be one of the major influences in Protestant thought."

Buber's influence on Christian thought is not to be accounted for by temperateness in his Jewish commitment. On the contrary, all his life has been a mission to the Jewish people. He has continually exhorted them to fulfil their heaven-sent destiny—to realize a community of peace and justice on earth. The conscience of Zionism (Jewish nationalism) has continually been troubled by Buber's insistence that the Jewish ideal be its first loyalty—that there is more to Zionism than the establishment of a small Jewish state in the Near East. His Zionist writings from the turn of the century to the present have embodied the universalistic nationalism of the Prophets. Israel must be a separate autonomous state in order to realize her true mission, but this mission involves more than the welfare of her own people; it involves the embodiment of true community as an example to the nations. For this reason, he has worked for Arab-Jewish amity as the cornerstone of true Zionism.

Buber and Hasidism

Buber's childhood in Central Europe brought him in contact with Hasidism, a pietistic Jewish sect, which began in Poland around 1750. The vital teachings of its many great Rabbis were hidden from mankind by the withdrawn character of the sect itself and only in recent years has there been an effort to expound them to the world. Buber has been a key figure in this effort because of the aesthetic and re-

ligious power with which he has refashioned many tales of the great masters of Hasidism.

Because the Hasidic movement developed in complete isolation from Christian teaching and culture the similarity between some of its emphases and the message of the Gospel is startling. In one tale a great Hasidic master sent his disciple Rabbi Bunam and a number of other *Hasidim* on a journey without telling them where to go or why he was sending them. When they came to an inn they were greeted with delight by the innkeeper who respected their great piety.

> Rabbi Bunam sat down in the main room, while the others went in and out and asked all sorts of questions concerning the meat which was to be served to them: whether the animal was unblemished, what the butcher was like, and just how carefully the meat had been salted. At that a man dressed in rags spoke up. He had been sitting behind the stove and still had his staff in his hand. "O you hasidim," he said, "you make a big to-do about what you put into your mouths being clean, but you don't worry half as much about the purity of what comes out of your mouths!"
>
> Rabbi Bunam was about to reply, but the wayfarer had already disappeared — for this is Elijah's habit. Then the rabbi understood why his teacher had sent him on this journey.[1]

His studies of Hasidism illustrate the interaction of social concern and scholarly endeavor which permeate all facets of Buber's work. Paul Tillich has described Buber's friendly relation to the Christian Socialist movement that flourished in Germany after the first World War. And Buber's vital interest in social philosophy led to his appointment as Professor of Social Philosophy at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, a post he occupied from the time he arrived in Israel in 1938 as a refugee from Nazi persecution until his retirement in 1952.

His close study of the mystical tradition was reflected in all of Buber's early writings. As his thought matured be became less captivated by mysticism and intensified his study of the Old Testament. During the years following the first World War there was a revival of interest in Jewish learning among the adult Jewish population of Central Europe. Buber and another Jewish scholar collaborated on a translation of the Old Testament into a German that would closely resemble the original Hebrew in flavor and structure. This translation was a great aid to this program of Jewish adult education, and Buber's many works of biblical exegesis supplemented it.

The Great Dialogue: *I and Thou*

As the focus of his studies shifted from the mysticism to the Old Testament, his own philosophy shifted from the mystical preoccupation with the union of man and God to an emphasis upon man as a creature of God related to Him in the great dialogue between heaven and earth.

---

[1]. Martin Buber, *Tales of Hasidim, The Later Masters*, p. 229.

With the publication of *I and Thou* in 1923 his thought attained definitive form. The main thesis of *I and Thou* is that man can take two attitudes toward the beings that confront him in the world. He can step back from them and let his attitude stiffen into one of detachment in which he categorizes them, codifies them, sets them in time and space, and investigates their causal relations. Ultimately his end is to use them. This is the I-It relation. Without it, Buber says, man cannot live, since it is through it that the world becomes reliable and communicable in an objective sense.

On the other hand, man can step into relation with the being that stands over against him fully affirming it in the uniqueness of its own existence. In such a relation the other is taken as a whole and becomes fully present to the self in a relation that is so overpowering as to be exclusive. While the paradigm for this relation, the I-Thou relation, is love between man and wife, it is important to see that in Buber's view the relation is not confined to persons. Man can know this relation with all beings, and a felicitous example is the relation between men and works of art. When seized by the power of a beautiful object, say Michaelangelo's *Moses*, I find that all the characteristics of the I-Thou relation are present: it is immediate, personal, exclusive and unique. Of particular interest is the mixture of grace and freedom that suffuses the situation. To be moved by the statue I must set myself before it, I must step into the relation: yet it may happen that I stand before it without being grasped by the sense of its beauty, without giving myself to the immediate sense of the power of this great work. On such an occasion I stand back in an attitude of detachment—more concerned with the quality of my experience of the work than with the beauty of the statue itself.

When a genuine encounter with the statue as a Thou takes place, the normal categories of time and place dissolve. I am no longer aware of standing before the statue of Moses in the Roman Church of "St. Peter in Chains." I am no longer aware of the day or the hour—the effective time is the duration of the full interplay of meaning between myself and the statue standing over against me as my Thou. Because the element of grace is so essential to the encounter, so that the occurence of true relation can never be predicted or plotted, the categories of casuality which govern the I-It realm are overcome by the spontaneity which is absolutely necessary to the I-Thou encounter.

Spheres in which "I" confronts "Thou"

Buber speaks of three spheres in which men confront their Thou: man with man, man with nature and man with intelligible forms, that is, man with the forms of art and thought. To be sure, one quality of the "I-Thou" encounter which pertains between man and man would

seem utterly foreign to an "I-Thou" encounter between man and nature or man and the intelligible forms—and that is mutuality. We would all insist that in an encounter with a tree or work of art, the other is not aware of us in the sense that we are aware of it. Buber is sensitive to this problem. He grants the point that the "I-Thou" relation between man and man is the main stream of the I-Thou relation, the others are but tributaries. He does not believe that there is a soul in the tree or a mind in a statue that responds to him as he responds to it. Why then, we may ask, does he insist on including these relations in the "I-Thou" realm? Because, he answers, the power of the encounter impresses itself upon him as an "I-Thou" relation: "The tree is no impression, no play of my imagination, no value depending on my mood; but it is bodied over against me and has to do with me as I with it—only in a different way . . . . I encounter no soul or dryad of the tree, but the tree itself."[2]

Another reason that Buber insists upon the all-embracing character of the "I-Thou" relation—on the fact that man may enter such a relation with all beings—is that he does not first accept the Universe as an "It" subject to the cold workings of impersonal causality which can be uncovered by the exercise of objective reason, and then detach a special area, that of the personal, which is free of this domination. Rather, he stands with Paul Tillich in the tradition of German mysticism and idealism which stresses the profund continuity between man and nature. For it is the totality of existence that ultimately stands to man in a relation of Thou or It depending upon the attitude he takes toward it. In periods of religious creativity men encounter God not only through their interpersonal contacts, but they come to see that: "In every sphere in its own way, through each process of becoming that is present to us, we look out toward the fringe of the eternal *Thou;* in each we are aware of a breath from the eternal *Thou;* in each *Thou* we address the eternal *Thou.*"[3]

The eternal Thou is like the sun in Plato's famous metaphor: as the sun is at once the source of illumination that is in all things and itself the most luminous object, so too the eternal Thou is the power that enables man to encounter all beings as his *Thou* and is itself the ". . . *Thou* that by its nature cannot become *It.*"[4]

Yet it is the tragic melancholy of man's fate that every Thou becomes an It. Man is unable to persist in the full spontaneity and immediateness of genuine relation to the other. Absorption gives way to detachment and the vividness of the experience in which the self un-

---

[2]. *I and Thou,* p. 8.
[3]. *Ibid,* p. 6.
[4]. *Ibid,* p. 75.

reservedly discloses itself to the other results in a *Reader's Digest* article entitled "The Most Unforgettable Experience I Ever Had."

Buber's Prophetic Function

By means of the language of *I and Thou* Buber powerfully expresses the prophetic criticism of organized religion. God never assumes the posture of an It to man. Yet man in ritual and creed continually makes God into an It, into a force that he can summon at will. Man refuses the insecurity of the life of graceful spontaneity and evolves religious institutions which regard their own forms of expression as ultimate. Institutions and the It world are necessary, but if they usurp the centrality of the Thou encounter which gave birth to them and prevent the renewal of that encounter, they subvert the holy cause that brought them into being. So too religion codifies and devitalizes the fundamental and powerful encounters between man and the eternal Thou which we call revelation.

Buber's understanding of revelation avoids the perils of fundamentalist literalism, which considers each word of the Bible to have been dictated by God to utterly passive human agents, and of modernism, which regards the Bible as being nothing more than the product of a seires of "religious geniuses." For Buber, God stands behind the Bible but not in an I-It objectively valid way. For example, in dealing with the miracle on the Red Sea, he insists that nothing which occurred disturbed the normal operation of cause and effect in nature. The waters divided because of a combination of tides and winds. However, the miracle involved was the concurrence of this natural phenomenon with the fateful hour in the destiny of the Jewish people. Other spectators might only have seen the natural forces at work, but the Israelites experienced this event as a miracle and came to see the power behind the phenomena as the One Who is on all occasions the effecting and ultimate One.

The Subjective Aspect of Revelation

Those familiar with the writings of Soren Kierkegaard, will not be surprised to learn that Buber was acquainted with the writings of this Christian existentialist when he developed this approach to revelation. However. Buber is not simply borrowing the perspectives of a Christian thinker and reading them into Judaism. He finds this view of revelation in Jewish sources such as this tale concerning the Baal Shem, the founder of Hasidism.

> A naturalist came from a great distance to see the Baal Shem and said: "My investigations show that in the course of nature the Red Sea had to divide at the very hour the children of Israel passed through it. Now what becomes of your famous miracle!" The Baal Shem answered: "Don't you know that God created nature? And he created it so that at the very hour

the children of Israel passed through the Red Sea, it had to divide. That is the great and famous miracle!"[5]

While all the I-Thou encounters which men experience ultimately point to the eternal Thou, the great moments in the history of Israel, like this crossing of the Red Sea, have a special status. For the unrepeatable character of historical events endows the biblical record of revelation with its unique character. Yet the Bible as the record of revelation is lifeless and all but meaningless unless its living message is appropriated in faith by the individual believer. Again we find that Buber is much indebted to Kierkegaard in his insistence that personal, passionate appropriation of the truths of revelation is an essential part of the process. And again we find that the emphasis is one which is indigenous to Judaism. In fact, Buber refers to the instruction of the Rabbis of the Talmud who urge the Jewish people in every generation to celebrate the Passover holiday, the holiday which commemorates the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, as though they themselves were in process of being redeemed from slavery to the Pharaohs.

The revealed teachings that Jews are urged to appropriate are not a rational body of truths which can be developed in logical fashion. Buber claims that the Bible is true to life in overriding logic. "According to the logical conception of truth only one of two contraries can be true, but in the reality of life as one lives it they are inseparable."[6] Thus we find that the powerful biblical utterance "For thus says the high and lofty One who inhabits eternity, whose name is Holy: 'I dwell in the high and holy place, and also with him who is of a contrite and humble spirit' " (Is 57:15) finds an echo in Buber: "Of course God is the 'wholly other'; but He is also the wholly same, the wholly present. Of course He is the *Mysterium Tremendum* that appears and overthrows; but He is also the mystery of the self-evident, nearer to me than my *I*.' "[7] This paradoxical mode of expression also reveals Buber's affinity with the thought of many contemporary Protestant theologians, as well as with that of Kierkegaard. Yet again we must remember that Buber derives these attitudes from his reading of Jewish sources.

People may become impatient with these paradoxes and wonder why it is necessary for man to hold both to God's wholly otherness and to His nearness to the self—"nearer to me than my *I*." For Buber they must be held because these paradoxes reflect the spiritual situation of man. If God were altogether beyond man's ken so that nothing whatsoever was known of Him, He could not be worshipped. If He were totally immersed in the world, He would not be worthy of worship. It is with this insight in mind that Buber criticizes the philosopher Alfred

[5]. Martin Buber *Tales of the Hasidim, The Early Masters.* p. 71.
[6]. *Israel and the World.* p. 17.
[7]. *I and Thou,* p. 79.

North Whitehead, who could not see how the Old Testament's statement that the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom could be reconciled with the New Testament view that God is love. "He who begins with the love of God," replies Buber, "without having previously experienced the fear of God, loves an idol which he himself has made, a god whom it is easy enough to love."[8]

Kierkegaard's insistence that religious truth, the truth that saves, is not a matter of objectively demonstrable propositions has exerted a tremendous influence on contemporary religious thought, and Buber is no exception. Religious statements, he insists, are not logical propositions or simple statements of fact, and religious truth is not to be equated with scientific knowledge. The man of faith must appropriate the saving truth of the great moments in Israel's history, yet, when he does so he must realize that there is no objective certainty connected with his religious convictions. The only certainty he can have is the knowledge of what these convictions have meant to him and to the people of Israel. Yet if man would know the meaning of life he must take the risk of faith. "And if one . . . asks if one may be certain of finding what is right . . . once again the answer is *no;* there is no certainty . . . . The disk does not ensure the truth for us; but it, and it alone, leads us to where the breath of truth is to be felt."[9]

Buber and Christianity

Because of his tremendous impact upon contemporary Protestant thought some people may regard Buber as a crypto-Christian. Professor Bennett is far more accurate in writing that "The Biblical faith in God is, from the Christian standpoint, fulfilled and most adequately expressed in Christ as the revealer and the mediator of God, but it is important to see in Buber how much of the Christian content of that faith is possible without an acceptance of the Christian mediation."[10]

Buber's thought is strongly Jewish. This is especially evident in his rejection of the Pauline tradition with its emphasis upon original sin. In his view, Adam's fall was in no sense decisive since each man stands in the situation of Adam. Each man may choose evil which, in Buber's view, is the failure to unify the self in a God-centered direction. Yet each man may also choose to be a partner of God in the work of redemption. Therefore, Buber sees the Christian claim of a final redemption in Jesus Christ as an unbridgeable gulf between Christian and Jew. "Pre-messianically our destinies are divided. Now to the Christian the Jew is the obdurate man, who declines to see what has happened; and to the Jew the Christian is the uncomprehensibly daring man, who

8. *Eclipse of God,* p. 51.
9. *Between Man and Man,* p. 71.
10. *Christianity and Crisis,* vol. XV, No. 24, p. 186.

affirms in an unredeemed world that its redemption has been accomplished. This is a gulf which no human power can bridge."[11]

Yet this is not his final word. Indeed he closed this same address—presented to a group of Christians who were conducting a mission to the Jews—with a passionate affirmation of the fundamental unity of men of true faith. "It behooves both you and us to hold inviolably fast to our own true faith, that is, to our own deepest relationship to truth. It behooves both of us to show a religious respect for the true faith of the other. This is not what is called 'tolerance', our task is not to tolerate each other's waywardness but to acknowledge the real relationship in which we both stand to truth. Whenever we both, Christian and Jew, care more for God himself than for our images of God, we are united in the feeling that our Father's house is differently constructed than our human models take it to be."

---

[11]. *Israel and the World*, p. 40.

Suggested Readings in Martin Buber

[Ed. Note: *The author has compiled this annotated bibliography at the request of the Editor, for those who wish to read further in works by and about Martin Buber.*]

His dialogic philosophy is presented in the following major works:

I and Thou, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

Between Man and Man, (paperback), The Beacon Press.

His biblical exegesis is contained in:

Moses, Oxford, East and West Library, 1946.

The Prophetic Faith, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1946.

Two Types of Faith, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1951. This is a study of the relation between the teachings of Jesus and the religion of Paul, and presents Buber's most extended treatment of Christianity.

His collection of Hasidic materials appears in:

Tales of the Hasidim, The Early Masters, and *Tales of the Hasidim, The Later Masters*, now distributed by the Noonday Press in New York City. These Tales constitute a rich vein of homiletical insight.

Ten Rungs, Hasidic Sayings, also distributed by the Noonday Press, constitutes a far less adequate collection of Hasidic materials.

Hasidism, New York, Philosophical Library, 1948, is a collection of essays interpreting the Hasidic movement.

A collection of his essays on Judaism is:

Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, New York, Shocken Books, 1948.

His outstanding work in the field of social philosophy is:

Paths in Utopia, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1949

The best interpretation of Buber's work is:

Maurice Friedman, *Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Will Herberg has published an anthology of Buber's work in an inexpensive paperback, and has provided a most illuminating introduction:

The Writings of Martin Buber, New York, Meridian Books, 1956.

The Faculty Re-Examines Its Work

John C. Bennett

The Union faculty is now doing the most intensive job of rethinking its methods of work, of re-examining the life and objectives of the seminary that it has done at any time in my memory. Often the faculty has been concerned with changes in the curriculum, but today we are studying our situation in a broader way and, I hope, on a deeper level than when we have been engaged chiefly in the reform of the curriculum. At least three things have happened which have prepared us for this process of re-examination.

Three Preparatory Factors

The first is the very great enlargement and diversification of the faculty. It is not merely an increase in the size of the faculty to meet the needs of a larger student body, but also the development of a faculty with a much wider age range, with many members of junior rank and quite new areas of study represented. Until recently, the faculty consisted chiefly of professors (all men) who could sit around one table in the old Directors' Room; but today when we have a faculty meeting there are over fifty persons who are entitled to attend. We have ten instructors, most of them on full time. We have three assistant professors and nine full-time associate professors. There are five women who have done much to change the atmosphere in our faculty circle, four Deans, and, at the moment, five visiting professors although our usual quota is two at any one time. And apart from the visiting professors, there are twenty-two senior professors. I am counting some individual twice in different categories, but this suggestion of variety will help many readers to imagine how different the faculty is now from what it was in their time.

A second factor is the variety of programs which are part of our seminary life. The two hundred and forty-five B. D. students remain by far the largest group of students, but they participate in such new programs as those involving Religion and Psychiatry and Religious Drama. Alumni who want to see the B. D. course remain the dominant one at Union can rest assured that this will continue to be the case.

But there are one hundred and twenty-five students enrolled for advanced degrees, eighty-nine for degrees in Sacred Music, and forty-one for our new degree of Master of Religious Education. The variety in terms of candidates for degrees does not fully suggest the variety of our student body. The division between men and women and between American students and students from abroad must also be considered. There are twenty-five students, mostly from Asia and Africa, in the Program of Advanced Religious Studies (PARS), which is housed in our new building at 49 Claremont and which has in part its own course of study.

One final factor which has helped to stimulate this re-examination of our life and work is that we have been exposed to the results of two studies of theological education, one very broad study by Professors Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Williams and James Gustafson under the auspices of the American Association of Theological Schools, and the more specialized study by Professor Samuel Blizzard while he was a Visiting Professor on our faculty. We spent three profitable evenings last year discussing with Professor Blizzard some of the findings to which his study has led him.

The "Retreat-Conference"

We began this process of re-examination in a very modest way through the appointment in the fall of 1955 of a regular committee of the Faculty on "Educational Policy". That committee has had a number of meetings and has made a few somewhat minor recommendations for immediate changes, but it has explored many more radical proposals and it regards its work as only just begun. Out of the discussions of this committee came the plan to hold the "Retreat-Conference" of the whole faculty at Seabury House on November 9-10 of last year. This article is intended to deal chiefly with this Retreat-Conference and some of its immediate results.

We have discovered one very important truth about group behavior: regular meetings of committees and even of the whole faculty which have prescribed responsibilities affecting administration and which are tied to minutes and to a conventional agenda do not usually raise as radical and far-reaching questions as *ad hoc* meetings which are expected to be a bit irresponsible so far as immediate results are concerned. I believe that this faculty Retreat-Conference will prove to be a very important turning point in our life as an institution and as a community.

Almost the whole faculty attended, forty-four in all. We met from lunch at 1:00 Friday until 5:00 Saturday afternoon and almost everyone was present for the whole period. We were in an ideal place for such a

meeting, a beautiful estate near Greenwich which the Episcopal Church has made its national center for many of its activities. We allowed ourselves enough free time for informal conversation. This was the first occasion on which this large and varied faculty has really felt that it was one working group. We have a fine sense of Christian community in general at Union but no previous occasions have given this faculty as good a chance to discover itself as a community. Even some of our professors who questioned in advance the value of this meeting became convinced that it had achieved something very important for our life and work together. We were much helped by our common worship.

There were three sessions on Friday afternoon and evening devoted to the subjects of the three chapters of Richard Niebuhr's book, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry*.[1] This book is the first published result of the study of theological education to which I have referred. The three chapters deal with "The Church and Its Purpose," "The Emerging New Conception of the Ministry," and "The Idea of a Theological School." I shall always remember the second session as a superb example of unplanned group dynamics! If we had planned it so, it would probably have failed with the Union Faculty, but after the session was over, the whole company divided spontaneously into about five groups which continued the discussion with much excitement. Most of the discussion was on the problem of authority and two issues were fused: the nature of the authority that our own thinking and teaching are under and the type of authority which the minister can expect to have with his congregation. On Saturday we had two sessions on the following subjects: 1) "The vocation of Union Seminary in relation to the pressures on it and to our various categories of students"; and 2) "the outlook of our students."

Issues Considered by the Faculty

Any attempt to summarize the results of our discussion would make the whole effort seem much less important than it is. We are at the beginning of a process. The most fundamental question which we faced was the nature of our vocation as a seminary. What should be the criteria for any additions to our program? There was no tendency among us to reduce any one of the categories of students which we now have, but we asked searching questions about how effective our contribution to the local parish is, and for what kinds of parish we should train men. We took account of the great increase in the demand for teachers of

[1]. This book was reviewed in the November, 1956 issue of the QUARTERLY REVIEW, p. 67, by James C. Livingston, former chairman of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

religion in the colleges and universities and for teachers in seminaries, some of them new seminaries. One of the most substantial aspects of the revival of interest in religion is in this area of higher education. We came away with the idea that we need to organize our resources more effectively for graduate work without necessarily increasing the proportion of graduate students.

We discussed at some length also the following issues and I am sure that we shall continue to discuss them: How far is the Union Seminary community an ecumenical community and what is our responsibility to those segments of the Church which are not usually represented among us? What are we to think of the new role of the minister as "pastoral director," to use Richard Niebuhr's term? What can he expect to be the basis of his authority? How can he be best prepared for continuing intellectual growth as well as for the administrative and organizing activities to which he must give so much of his time? We raised the question very seriously as to how far it is possible for the churches with help from the seminaries to include in their image of the good minister his keeping intellectually alive. In this connection, what should the seminary do outside its regular curriculum to help its graduates?

We gave much attention to the usual criticisms of the curriculum and especially to its fragmentation, to the large number of courses which students take at one time, to the relationship between the practical departments and the other departments (it is hard to name them as a whole without seeming to deny something to the practical departments!).

We took more seriously than ever before the responsibility of regularizing the practice of having students take a year out for some kind of internship experience between the second and the third years.

Future Discussion

As soon as we returned from this Retreat-Conference the faculty divided into four *ad hoc* groups which will have several meetings in order to bring more specific recommendations to the faculty. These groups are entirely different from the regular committees of the faculty, and they deal with some subjects which cut across the areas of our committees. They are discussing the following subjects: the junior year, foreign students, the graduate program, the problem of fragmentation and integration.

Whatever these groups report and whatever may be adopted by the faculty, I believe that something has happened to the faculty itself that may be more important in the end than institutional changes. More than at any time since we have become so large a group we are a united faculty; we are more aware of the importance of taking seriously the

work of departments other than our own. Ultimately the student must do his own integrating of what he learns. He may be greatly helped by various external changes in the curriculum, but he is likely to be helped even more by professors who, without trying to "integrate," have become aware of the relevance of their teaching to other fields and to some of the problems which the student will encounter in his ministry. When I say these things I always want to make one reservation: Union would be less than it has been if this interest in integration should become pressure to conform, if it should cause the members of our faculty to lose the freedom to be themselves as teachers and the seminary to lose the variety of contributions which its professors now make. This is not an immediate danger!

THE INTEGRITY OF PREACHING

JOHN KNOX

A strong case for more and better biblical preaching, as the *only* type relevant for our time—because it re-creates in the twentieth century the vital event of the first century—the event of Christ. *February 11.* *$1.75*

THE INEVITABLE CHOICE

EDMUND DAVISON SOPER

Vedanta philosophy or Christian Gospel? Here is a succinct account of the history, teaching, and modern revival of this Eastern religion. But *more* important is how Dr. Soper proves that Christianity—far superior to all religions—can meet the intellectual and spiritual needs of all people. *$2.50*

THE CHRISTIAN AND THE WORLD OF UNBELIEF

LIBUSE LUKAS MILLER

Examines epistemology, philosophy, social science, ethics, culture, and history, pointing out the fallacies of nonbelievers—then demonstrating that Christian categories offer the most satisfactory solutions to modern problems. *$4.75*

SURVEY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

W. W. SLOAN

A synopsis of the Old Testament, placing characters and events in their proper historical perspective, and showing a people's gradual discovery of God. Supplemental reading lists, names to remember, and assignments at the end of each chapter. *$3.50*

VOLUME 6 The Interpreter's Bible

Christendom's Most Comprehensive Commentary

Volume 6 contains complete texts—in both King James and Revised Standard versions—and commentary on fifteen important but little understood books of the Old Testament—Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Twelve Prophets. *$8.75*

at all bookstores

ABINGDON PRESS

Psychiatry and the Christian Ministry

Earl A. Loomis, Jr.

There was a time when this title, *Psychiatry and the Christian Ministry*, would be met with suspicion and surprise, perhaps with the rejoinder, "Don't you mean *Psychiatry vs. The Christian Ministry?!*" The very presence of this discussion is sufficient evidence of the change that has been going on for the past twenty years in the thinking of both psychiatrists and clergymen. That we are now kissing cousins is hardly debatable. What some of the implications of our growing intimacy and lack of defensiveness are is open to profound questioning and probing investigation.

Whenever two movements, two ideas, or two beings really confront one another in some meaningful dimension, something happens to them both. In his book on Dostoievski, Thurneysen tells of the man who looks out into the peaceful scene of his farmyard. He sees the patient kine, the faithful horse, the earthy swine, the responsive hound, the proud tomcat, the sprightly lizard, and the pedestrian barnfowl each going quietly about his Sunday afternoon leisure, the hen perhaps persuing not too enthusiastically an elusive earthworm. The man watches, equally under the spell of ennui. His mind drifts off and in a flash the scene is transformed . . . The animals are replaced by ferocious denizens of the jungle. The wolf, the tiger, the python, and the vulture are on the verge of devouring one another and him. He shrinks back in fear, reality returns, and he discovers it was just a fantasy or was it? He never quite is sure whether his glimpse of wildness and ferocity was really a potential within the kindly domesticated beasts or whether it was a projection onto them, convenient targets as they were, of the inner ferocity of his deepest and unknown self, his primordial *id*, his unconscious jungleland. Before speculating about this point Thurneysen goes on to say that such a vision is what one experiences when he reads the pages of a novel by Dostoievski. He adds something to the effect that "He who has seen himself through the mirror of Dostoievski's works will never look the same to himself again!"

The Contemporary Encounter and Collision

There is a sense in which neither psychiatry nor religion can or will escape their current meeting unscathed, unchanged, or at least unexamined. We are well past the days in which the psychiatrist as expert with a new kit of tools can examine religion or religious persons under his analytic microscope as if it or they were bugs, objects, things, in which the scrutinizer had a casual interest, scientifically concerned, but in no way touched or changed since no meeting was occuring. Likewise the churches and their spokesmen are scarcely more able today to study the theories and practices of psychiatric schools and therapists, sorting them into convenient categories created by theology, metaphysics or morality, but remaining untouched themselves.

These measurements from a distance, this surveying operation without involvement, and all coldly objective approaches have outlived their usefulness for the area of human relations, and are of historical interest as phenomena rather than as forces with which we have to cope today. We no longer have to defend religion against scientific psychology in the simple old way nor do we have to prove that psychiatry does not affront religion and is really a fairly safe house pet to have around. One reason we don't have to disprove these things is that we are not so sure we want to. Perhaps both tame psychiatry and tame religion are the last things we really need today. Perhaps we are scared enough by other realities to face the frightening in the interfaces between our relations, which, as Buber terms them, occur "between man and man", on the one hand, and "between man and God", on the other. These two aspects are no longer agreeably at an amiable distance; they are approaching collision and we, decision.

So, it is with a certain sense of nostalgia that we must turn from the more consoling reassurances that our fields can dwell in peace, live and let live, that all we need to know is where to draw the line between them, that all psychiatrists have to know is where their domain ends and the minister's begins, that all the pastor needs to know is how and where to refer someone whom the psychiatrist is better equipped to handle. Truth there is in some of these principles, but they evade and hence deny the most basic and more relevent truth: namely, that psychiatry and religion are in encounter and both will show the marks of the engagement.

Why this confrontation of one field by the other should occur should be obvious. They both claim responsibility for comprehensive formulations about man, his nature, his behavior, his relationships, and his values. Psychiatry for long tried to evade the issue of values, but it has become clear to most members of my profession that values are here

to stay and that while we may try to ignore them in the content of our work, we influence them and have an influence upon them whether we like it or not. So it is high time we take responsibility for the study of the impact of the values of the therapist, expressed or unexpressed, upon the patient, and *naturally enough*, of the patient on the therapist.

The other side of this coin is that willynilly, like it or not, accept it or protest, ministers are accepting or being forced into roles involving the possibility of healing or hurting relationships, psychiatrically speaking. Whether they want or try to be psychiatrists or not—and we hope they do not—they are involved in situations with psychotraumatic and psychotherapeutic potential every day of their ministry. To both the psychiatrist and the minister, then, it is important to heed the injunction ascribed to Jesus in the Codex Bizae gloss on Luke 6:4: "Blessed art thou, if thou knowest what thou art doing!"

It is, however, with no motive to make psychiatrists or psychotherapists out of ministers that I am making this plea. I am rather uttering words of caution with regard to the potency of the instruments, even weapons, which we handle. Both psychiatrists and minister may well look to God to hallow the treasure despite the earthen vessels and muddy channels which contain and transmit them. The presence of this faith should hardly excuse either profession from searching the possibilities for more insightful application of their knowledge, more fruitful sowing of their seed, more sensitive perception of the human situation.

Opposition to the Encounter

An intelligent question at this point would be: "But why, after all these years of knowing how to handle the Word, the sacraments and the flock, should the church require new or changed approaches to man's condition, which basically hasn't changed?" And what but confusion and heresy and anxiety has psychiatry to add, anyhow? We have enough trouble within, without inviting intruders who may undermine our foundations, deflect our aim, or make us, like the centipede, so self-conscious that in our wondering how to do what used to "come naturally" we find ourselves paralyzed in perseverative rumination.

Some psychiatrist's objection to the recent moves toward closer relations would sound surprisingly similar: "But the church has always stood for the past, for obscurantism, and for hypocritical morality. It confuses acts and motives, underwrites the most neurotic moralisms, and provides escapes from any realistic and responsible ethics. It attempts everywhere to do what secular agencies and institutions can do better—and more *cleanly*. Why get 'messed up' with such a 'messed up' outfit?"

These extremes may not be typical of the most sophisticated ministers and psychiatrists, but we still have to deal with *the fear at the interfaces*, and before we can plan to do this we must understand a little more of the variety of modes of relation, quasi-relation and non-relation that offer themselves to the confused chooser of a point of view. Each has its advocates, each its justifications, each its pitfalls. And each of us chooses one or more of these ways of handling the situation, to the extent that we meet it and accept responsibility for response to it.

Seven Possible Modes of Relationship

There is something historical about the order in which I will present the seven modes of interaction which seem to cover most of the possibilities of relationship between psychiatry and religion. Yet to some extent they are and have been all present in some circles all along.

I. The Battle to the Death

A few diehards still write of the other's field as if it constituted the world's greatest menace, whose elimination would bring in the millenium. Fifty years ago this was the prevailing opinion; today it is just about gone. At least it is so unpopular that its remaining advocates have adopted protective coloration. These are the fanatics for whom both professions feel obliged to apologize. An example would be the rare but real psychoanalyst who really believed that as long as his patient practiced or believed his religion he was certainly ill, that the price of health was atheism. His counterpart in the ministry is the clergyman who forbids his parishioners to receive psychiatric help on pain of near excommunication.

Many persons from both sides who took this position in the past were doubtless sincere and well-informed about a segment of psychiatry or a segment of religion. They were often right in their judgments concerning what they really knew, but they made serious *sampling errors*, and in consequence, made hasty generalizations which led them into gross misjudgment. More right, however, than somewhat more wooly thinkers, they sensed that basic and crucial issues were at stake, and like mother bears coming to the defense of their young, they would not risk the causes they valued so dearly in the interest of easy compromise.

II. Ostracism

A second approach to the psychiatry-religion boundaries was that of building high walls. One didn't attack the enemy, but the higher the

walls and the more the foe was ignored, the greater the likelihood that one could overlook his threat and rest peacefully. I have known clergymen who did not even know whether there was a psychiatrist in their town, let alone his name or what sort of guy he was. And some psychiatrists have baldly pretended that any ignorance they had of religion, sometimes even that of the patient in their care, was a virtue. Ordinarily, to ostracize means to ignore. The latter is, however, acting as though the other does not exist, denying his being, or, in effect, as far as oneself is concerned, eliminating the irritant from the universe one recognizes as real and meaningful. Thus, a lot of post-psychiatric religious writing tries to ignore the impact of psychodynamics. This barely comes off, however, since, whether we like it or not the public often is better informed in this area than professionals. Contrariwise, a few psychiatric writers are still dealing with religion as it was a hundred or fifty years ago and seem unaware of the growing sensitivity of theologians and pastors to the emotional needs of the parish and the importance of the minister's own emotional life.

Justified or unjustified, ostracism remains an approach from both sides, or rather, a non-approach. But this is still an approach. It is reminiscent of the boys who walked down the street until they saw another gang of boys approaching. The leader said, "Let's ostracize them!" And the boys did—by throwing rocks at the other crew!

So, whether we praise with faint damns or damn with faint praise, we may well ask ourselves, Is this our mode of relating?

III. Peaceful Co-existence

Ever since the cold war began it has been the hope of a good many persons that "peaceful co-existence" with totalitarianism could be effected. A fair-sized segment of the ministry and psychiatry take an attitude of this type: live and let live! They have nothing particularly bad to say about one another. The psychiatrist may even go to church and the clergyman to a psychiatrist. But each sees the other's as a field apart, mostly unrelated, and himself uninvolved with the other's methods and goals. Out of such a situation comes most of the consoling platitudes about how much good the other profession does, but always with the cautious *caveat*: "And keep your hands off it!" While the cautions in many instances are certainly justified, the underlying implication that there is no basis for meaningful relationship and interaction is, in my opinion, false. This is another way of kidding oneself, letting the camel's head in under the door, and designing a new sheepskin coat for the wolf. Psychiatry does and should threaten the church and vice versa, and collision is inevitable. What will come out of the collision is the issue.

IV. Gobbling Up, Subsumption, or Masquerading

A popular way of handling differences today is just to take them into your system and make them a part of your larger whole. It is sort of like the young lady from Niger. Mastery by assimilation is just fine for the assimila*tor*, but what about the assimilat*ee*? When psychiatrists feel that religion is just fine, but is really a branch of psychiatry, or when ministers feel, *mutatus mutandis*, that the obverse is true, a serious problem of identity arises. It is at this point that the objections voiced by Finley Gayle in his American Psychiatric Association Presidential Address may be cogent and germane. He suggests that all too often psychiatrists are forgiving sins and ministers masquerading as psychotherapists. Much could be said in this regard about the temptations to both the "white coat complex" (by ministers) and the "confessional complex" (of the psychiatrists).

Such subsumption or presumption deserves the critique of the Chassidic rabbi who was called to settle a boundry dispute between landowners. Each claimed the disputed portion which lay between their unquestioned holdings. After listening long to both sides of the case the rabbi stooped down and for a time attentively placed his ear to the ground. On finally getting to his feet he reported: "Friends, your dispute left me in confusion, so I went to the source, the ground itself. And the ground answered my puzzlement, for it said to me: 'Tell them that I do not belong to them, but they to me, and that sooner or later I will claim them both. Therefore, in the meantime let them live in peace and both enjoy me.' " If we really heard the rabbi, our questions of professional priority would be stilled.

V. The Using of the Other for One's Own Ends

Related to, but different from, the "gobbling up" phenomenon is that of putting the other discipline to *use* in the service of the one. Examples can be heard in such remarks as: "The patients were hard to handle until we got a chaplain; and now that he brings them religion the wards are quieter." The counterpart is of course the engaging of a psychiatrist and the concurrent tying of his hands. So often I cannot number them I have had calls from persons requesting a "Christian Psychiatrist." By this they meant no anti-semitism. What they wanted was a psychiatrist who would promise in advance that their treatment would not undermine the patient's faith. No honest psychiatrist can make this promise even if he were to take active steps to promote religion in the life of his patient. For the road to self discovery is devious and may lead through the un-

masking of, and disenchantment with, what one thought was genuine—it might turn out that the person learned through his therapy how *little* faith he had. (Fortunately the opposite is often also true.) The same strangle hold on a minister is fatal. He cannot operate under coercion to obscure or conceal his ministry as he sees it. He can never promise that he will not or *will* "proselitize". And yet both types of demands are not uncommonly contained in tacit if not explicit limitations for institutional clergy.

There is something basically immoral about such positions: persons are not to be *used*, certainly not without regard for their own needs and potential. "Tame" ministers and "tame" psychiatrists are not what this world needs.

VI. Peripheral Contact

A sixth possible type of relationship of psychiatry and religion is that of peripheral contact and overlapping areas. This is the quiet, friendly, chummy sort of situation that arises between two men of the two professions who have learned to work together, knowing their own limitations and those of the other and respecting each other. This relation is benign, and productive, and one for which we are grateful. I have enjoyed it in mental hospitals with a number of chaplains. Each learns how the other operates and how to help or at least not hinder the work of the opposite number. Yet neither is deeply challenged or changed by the encounter since both are probably benign and gentle to start with, basically "nice guys". Without casting aspersions at graciousness and pleasantness, I propose that there is a sense in which if no anger or difference, if no contradiction or affront, occurs between the two men or the two disciplines, then perhaps nothing really happens, really changes. Perhaps not much deep searching goes on for "all's well anyhow". Nevertheless, we should not under-estimate the relative value of such relations as refreshing contrasts with the all-too-frequent tense contests and unresolved tensions.

VII. Responsive Interaction

I am not sure how to describe what I mean by this last category. What I am reaching for is an expression of what happens when two powerful forces or ideas or beings interact mutually, how they are both changed by having come together, and how hopefully both are better for the experience. Models in the fields of mechanics and physics come readily to mind. One can construct a picture of caroming billiard balls and richocheting bullets that indicates some aspects. But the encounters with which I am concerned are with people—dedicated, committed persons,

men and women who meet one another around the deepest and highest and most urgent issues of life and find that they have different ways of formulating them. This throws them both back on their haunches and leaves them another opportunity to approach the situation from another angle. But the point is, even as they are working on the problem, they are already different as a result of the first attempt. They can never be the same again.

One of these areas of interaction is that of *communication.* Both psychiatry and religion are learning more and more that communication may be both something more than, and also sometimes something different from, the formal verbal exchange. The area of non-verbal communication approaches the interfaces of the two fields.

For full communication to occur something more than words is called for. The deepest and most meaningful and most indispensable contents of communication are preverbally acquired, at least initially. Their recall and resurrection probably only fully acquire personal emotional and "existential" power and meaning in contexts which reconstruct in considerable measure the relational and interpersonal qualities in which the laying down occurred.

All too often the words become separated from the feelings to which they ought to refer. In fact we rarely express or verbalize concern about the most basic infantile contents until long after we have forgotten their reality in relation. How many recall the taste of mother's milk, the feel of a wet diaper, or the intrauterine enveloping by fluid? Perhaps in a dream or fantasy bits are recovered here and there, but by and large these are lost. Yet at 25 or 50 we begin to conceptualize around topics like basic trust, the I-not-I problem, etc., long after they have been solved (for good or ill) existentially. Indeed, it may well be in parenthood that one first re-discovers that he or she *knows* how a baby feels, but cannot tell how he knows—probably through being a baby oneself and having the feelings recalled by the new member of the family and his capacity to communicate all-too-non-verbally, although sometimes not too non-vocally.

From time to time in therapy, in relationships, in community, in crises we come to feel that communication has occurred without or despite words. In religious experience this has been reported countless times. To what extent is this a spontaneous, uncontrolled and uncontrollable phenomenon, how is it inherited, learned, or otherwise received and transmitted, and what is its relation to knowledge and to life?

To the foregoing unanswered questions I would add my hunch and hope that there is relationship if not identity between non-verbal communication, a special aspect of relationship which may turn out to be most basic, and common grace, a quality, or power, or message, or "per-

son" which theology sees as coming to man from God. Some speculative parallels would lie in its silence, its ineffability, its probable presence in the earliest daybreak of life, its constituting a free and unearned gift, and its healing potential. Furthermore, I should like to hear more about its transmissibility through channels, its accessibility to human seeking, directing, or otherwise modifying its flow, and also the pathology of its misdirection, damming up, and their results in spiritual, religious, and common life. Someone has said that if hate is love dammed, the devil is God dammed up. Is this relevant? Can "ungrace be transmitted non-verbally in the theological sense, as it can be psychologically?"

Personally I believe that psychiatry and religion will never be the same again by virtue of their encounter in and between the lives of men and women, priests and parishioners, therapists and patients. They will go on colliding, conversing, addressing themselves to the challenges and claims of one another and they will continue to change.

So far as I know there is nothing holy about change as change. There is much to be said for stability and constancy. But growth inevitably implies change and so does learning. May the encounters ahead be for growth and learning and creativity.

An entertaining thrust at secular values in the pulpit.

Dear Charles

Letters to a Young Minister

By WESLEY SHRADER

Frankly fictional, Professor Astute, gives his protege—a former seminary student—a complete program for success. His advice on the ways to become a "successful" minister covers everything which he considers to be essential. His many practical recommendations take the form of commentaries on the secular techniques often applied in a misdirected ministry.

In twenty-six letters the crafty professor counsels Charles on such matters as pulpit and personal restraints; the promotion of tithing; ministerial salesmanship; social activities and effectiveness; recreation; publicity and other areas that can be turned to a minister's advantage.

"It is a gem in conception and style."
C. P. Hunter, *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*

$2.50

Available at your bookstore or

The Macmillan Company
60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

Who Is Worthy?

Edwin M. Good

> And I saw in the right hand of him who was seated upon the throne a scroll, written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals; and I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, "Who is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals?" And no one in heaven or on earth or under the earth was able to open the scroll or look into it. And I wept much that no one was found worthy to open the scroll or to look into it. Then one of the elders said to me, "Weep not; lo, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals." And between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders, I saw a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, with seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth; and he went and took the scrolls from the right hand of him who was seated on the throne.
>
> (Rev. 5:1-7)

It's the hiddenness, that "Cloud of Unknowing," that worries us. If only we knew what was to come, we could cope with it. But day after meaningless day strides inexorably toward us, and we aren't able to brush the days aside fast enough to see what's beyond the whole procession. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof," to be sure, but what is to be sufficient unto the sum of the evil of all the days? Mankind has always been burdened down by this myth (and by myth I don't mean a fancy or untrue story), this myth of inscrutable destiny. What is ahead for me? What is ahead for mankind? No one can tell us, and so we weep, like the seer of the Apocalypse, because no one can "open the scroll," that book which contains the destiny of mankind. And yet, this amazing author goes on, someone can open it, indeed, he has. "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain. . . ." Perhaps that rather bizarre picture of a Lamb with seven horns and seven eyes bothers you. All right, look past the symbol to what is behind it. Destiny, says John the Divine, is in the hands of Christ. He is worthy to open the scroll and to break its seals; he is able to know and to control the destiny of mankind. This is the problem we all face, the myth of inscrutable destiny, and the solution for John is the conquering Christ.

It's the angel who puts the question, and this is the issue of human life: "Who is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals?" Who is worthy indeed? To whom can we entrust our destiny? This is the problem of religion. We might substitute for destiny the word "meaning." Who is worthy to be the meaning of life? And let us not fool ourselves. It is in the outcome of life that life receives its meaning. Certainly, we can go along finding little meanings in the stars and the flowers, but the real issue is, what does life mean when taken in its entirety? When it's a matter of the end of life, to whom will you entrust meaning then? Who then will be worthy to open the scroll of your destiny, to unseal the outcome of your life? Who then will be worthy to be the revealer of the meaning of creation, to unseal the outcome of God's work? This is the question which the angel asks.

And the answer is a curious silence. "No one was able to open the scroll," no one in heaven (that's surprising), or on earth, or under the earth. Do we catch an echo of the Decalogue? ". . . any graven image of anything that is in heaven above or in the earth beneath or in the water under the earth; you shall not bow down to them or serve them." To entrust destiny, to entrust meaning, is to worship, and nothing within man's ken, seemingly, is worthy of being worshipped, nor is it able to claim worship.

And so the seer weeps, and the world weeps with him, because there is no one who can open the scroll of destiny to it. This is the world's tragedy. "Cursed be he who trusts in man," said Jeremiah, and the world knows the truth of that. This is mankind's tragedy. It's your tragedy and mine. Man is neither trustful nor trustworthy. And John the Divine wept for good reason. "No one was found worthy to open the scroll or to look into it."

But one of the elders speaks now to him: "Weep not; for lo, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals." A victory has been won. The Lion of Judah, the avenging Messiah, has won the battle, and now we await his triumphant homecoming. Soon the conqueror, bloodied with the stains of his fallen opponents, will step into the vast heavenly court, proudly take the scroll, and dramatically break the seals. The great assemblage seems poised, listening for the rush of the approaching hosts, like the roaring of many waters.

But the conqueror has already come. There he stands, silent and unnoticed among the courtiers and retainers. No Lion of Judah, no bombastically striding warrior, but a Lamb. He is bloody from the war, not with the stain of slain foes but with his own blood. He has lost the battle in winning it. He stands there, as if he had been slain. This is the great reversal. The conqueror is the most defenceless, the weakest, the sacrifice,

dumb like a lamb before its shearers. A strangely mute Savior, this. The Lamb never speaks in the book of Revelation. He merely goes, quietly but with authority, and takes the scroll from the Almighty. As he took the Cross without a word, so he takes the book of the meaning of mankind's life without a word. Why should he speak, when he is himself the only word mankind needs?

So the myth of inscrutable destiny is solved. "Worthy art thou to take the scroll and to open its seals." God has been with men, and so God can be trusted with our destiny. "The future of creation," as Ethelbert Stauffer says, "is put under the sign of the cross." Not that we know any more about what is to come than we knew before. But we know whose we are, where our destiny lies. "For thou wast slain and by thy blood didst ransom men for God." The tragedy of having nowhere to turn is overcome. "Behold, the dwelling of God is with men. . . . He will wipe away every tear from their eyes."

> Weep not for lo, the Lion of the tribe of Judah has conquered. . . . And I saw . . . a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain. . . . And he went and took the scroll from the right hand of him who was seated on the throne.

Announcing:
(Especially for
Union Alumni)

By Prof. PAUL TILLICH

"A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT"

Recorded and edited by Peter H. John

Second edition, corrected and enlarged, 1956. 8½ x 11", 309 pages, four new sermons, 43-page primary and secondary bibliography, index.

Order from: Peter H. John, 87 Prairie Avenue, Providence 5, R.I.

Price: $5.25 postpaid.

The Web and The Cross

Malcolm Boyd

"What *is* the press today? What *is* a journalist today? How do you draw the line between one and another kind of operation in the vast field of news, discussion, entertainment, soap-operas and other tripe which we lump under the one word communications?" Henry R. Luce raised these questions in delivering the Eric W. Allen Memorial Lecture at the University of Oregon's School of Journalism.

Indeed, the whole world seems caught up in the technological-psychological web loosely labeled 'communications'. If we are to communicate effectively, we must see clearly *what* we want to communicate. Then, we must understand to some degree how we are to achieve communication within the frenzied, babelian nightmare of that web in which we are, along with everyone else, enmeshed. To deny the reality that we are enmeshed in such a web is delusion.

The Web of Communications

Ironically, we may become so conditioned by other factors operating ceaselessly upon us within the web of communications, that the very communication we undertake becomes, in effect, either the opposite of what we had intended as communication, or else an implicit communication negating our offering of explicit communication.

What if this happens to our communication of the Gospel? What if we become so absorbed in emulation of this age's success standards that our preachment of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is out-shouted by our quite obvious preoccupation with the standards antithetical to His life and mission? Then, it will only be disaster to multiply the number of our publications and our TV programs and our films, for our message will be inherently demonic.

Sociologists are engaged in an academic discussion about the necessity of reaching opinion leaders if one wants to reach the masses of people. Personal influence is seen as a kind of *detour of influence* from mass media; the mass media information is detoured through an opinion leader to other persons. This is labeled 'two-step communication'.

In an interview in *Printers' Ink*, Sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld was asked: "What are the most significant identifying factors for opinion

leaders? Is it sex? Age? Family size? Location in the United States? Rural? Suburban? Exurban? Are there any particular identifying factors by which you can separate opinion leaders from opinion followers?" Dr. Lazarsfeld replied:

> You are either an opinion leader for marketing or you are an opinion leader for movies. The general opinion leader is a very rare thing. For instance, if you want to know what's going on in foreign policy you obviously would ask a person who studied the field in college. But if you want to know what kind of soup to buy, you seek out the woman who has a lot of children.
>
> The one thing we can say definitely is that by and large opinion leaders come from the same economic strata as the people who seek the advice.
>
> We used to believe that influence starts at the top of the economic ladder and goes down to the bottom. We feel now that something very different happens . . . that person-to-person communication occurs between people on the same economic levels. We like to call this 'horizontal opinion' leadership. The working class has its own opinion leaders; salesgirls have their own opinion leaders. Ideas travel along rather narrow strata, and not so much from one stratum into the next.

However, one stratum is influenced by another stratum. The persons, therefore, within one stratum are influenced by the persons within another stratum. A mass media influence felt by one stratum will, in time, be felt by another stratum. This is what is meant by a total cultural context of influence. We have labeled this as a web of communications.

The Word in the Web

Now, our purpose (and we are so commanded) is to preach the Word of God, to bring others to Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Living as we do in the Age of Publicity, new and startling weapons and techniques are ours for the asking. Indeed, such areas as 'the world of TV' or 'the world of the press' are to be claimed for the lordship of Christ. So our problem is not so simple as merely one of *using* various communications media and techniques for Christ; we are to *claim* for Christ whole cultural areas in which we are, as Christians, involved. But which media and techniques are we to employ (after we have claimed them), and which are we to abstain from employing? Which, in fact, are we to praise, and which are we to expose as standing under wrath?

There can be no generalization in arriving at an answer. In one specific instance one will use a medium or technique in Christian evangelism, in another specific instance one will abstain from such use. This will stem from the fact that we claim all media and techniques for Christ. Consequently, we are guided in our assessment of media and techniques by our seeking after the will of Christ for them and for us. What we earnestly seek is a release from serving the demonic against Christ, in our stewardship of whatever aspects of radio, TV, films or the press which may happen to be under our tutelage.

One dangerous development which increasingly and frequently marks the contemporary Church is a preoccupation with, and employment of, the cult of the celebrity. The 'democracy of sinners' is obscured by the attention and applause given one sinner, as over against some other sinners. Celebrities sell magazines, so a church periodical uses a celebrity picture on a cover. Celebrities draw crowds, so an actor or a local 'wheel' is exhibited as an occasion for fund-raising. Celebrities result in TV-radio audiences, so a church show 'stars' a celebrity. Jesus Christ is presumably, in such a case, to be preached *through* the celebrity; or else the celebrity, once the crowd is assured, is to get out of the way, and Jesus Christ will be preached in a simple, non-paradoxical set-up wherein the total cultural context is instantly swept away. Here, one may rationalize: the 'simple gospel' is proclaimed in a 'simple' way; there is no communications web in which the preacher is enmeshed with the audience; everyday in every way, in fact, we are getting better and better.

To sell less copies of the church periodical, to attract a smaller TV-radio audience, to rake in fewer dollars for the new church building: this is a hard decision to reach by an act of the will. Yet, how sad to sell a lot of 'religious' publications which, by the way they are sold, out-shout the Gospel. How sad to build an immense TV-radio audience, only to become immersed in the 'spirit of the age', to be preaching implicitly the star-system and the celebrity-cult. How self-defeating to raise many dollars and erect a church building, if, to the huckster, the church building is not the Church but only a den of thieves from whom the huckster wants to learn a few new tricks.

The Church in the Web

The relationship between the Church and the Lord of the Church, between the body and the Head of the body, is of paramount importance. Can the Church expect 'success' in witnessing to its Lord when the Church distorts the life and meaning of its Lord? Can the Church, if disloyal to its Lord to the extreme degree of implicitly preaching against Him, lay serious claim to being, in practice, the Body of Christ? Stephen Neill in *The Christian Society* stresses how Jesus made no secret of the irreconcilable opposition which must exist between His society and all societies organized on other foundations. Secular societies exist to fulfil limited and temporal exigencies; they are based on calculation, on a balance of authorities, on coercive power; their aims are success, security and worldly prosperity. "The new society may have its times of prosperity and of amicable adjustment with the other types of society that condition the life of men; the inner opposition is ineradicable, and makes impossible a final reconciliation between the new society and the

old. The society of the Crucified must be neither surprised nor dismayed, if it finds itself perennially called to bear the cross."

A recent Hollywood 'religious' motion picture illustrates the irony of being caught up in the moral ambiguities common to all institutions, projects and persons, yet, at the same time, being caught up in the implications of motivational purity. On the one hand, *The Ten Commandments* is seen (by its press agents) as being a deeply religious cinematic vehicle and, on the other hand, fantastic global box-office grosses are anticipated (and planned, by barring few tricks of exploitation). So far, so good; one does not muzzle the ox. In this case, motion picture exploitation has moved into the tenuous area of 'religious promotion'. The Church, too, is caught up in moral ambiguities; the Body of Christ is visible in the earthen vessel of an economic, social and political institution encompassing sinful men who are burdened with selfish motives. And clergy are all a part of the game of exploitation for *The Ten Commandments*. For months, clerics had been photographed on the movie set, collars in place, looking enthusiastic for the photographers. And why not? The photographers, for once, were happy that they could publicize something 'worthwhile', 'good', and 'beneficial for mankind'. The clerics were happy that the Word of God was being proclaimed to the masses of the world.

The resultant publicity material is a gold-mine of exploitation but an indictment of the naivete and celebrity-consciousness of the Church. The Church is called upon to decide, without undue sentimentality and emotionalism, whether this particular $13,500,000 'religious' film of incalculable potential cultural influence is, in the first place, a religious motion picture and, then, if it is a Christian motion picture. If the film is found lacking, how may one undo the clerically-integrated publicity campaign in terms of its quite explicit Imprimatur?

There is a more crucial question. Is moral ambiguity acceptable to the Church and to the makers of the 'religious' motion picture? Can a confusion of motives be 'self-accepted' and offered to Jesus Christ in the one perfect Sacrifice of Himself, or must a confusion of motives be rationalized away? However, in accepting the fact of moral ambiguity, what if hopelessness or inertia strangely result? Can the tension be lived with, that we shall surely fail in combining resolute action with cleanliness of motivation, but that this 'failure'—when confessed to God with honest repentance—may itself be sanctified by the Holy Spirit so that it becomes 'success'?

The Cross in the Web

Christ was graphically shown by Satan, in the temptation in the wilderness, various types of worldly 'success'. Christians are being given a

satanic, technicolored, vista-visioned view of worldly 'success' in our own time. It is so rosy, the Cross is not in it. Enmeshed as we are in the common web of communications, it is not a difficult thing to forget altogether the Cross ('medieval', 'morbid', 'unhappy', 'scary') and to like the bloodless rosy hue without it. Yet, as has been stated earlier, we must, if we are to communicate effectively, see clearly *what* we want to communicate. As Christians, we want to preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified. This requires the Cross.

It is easy to discern what is happening to us, as Christians, in the communications web of our age and society. We are being evangelized more than we are evangelizing. This can mean a brain-washing process after which we will go right on evangelizing, but *what* will *we* be evangelizing for? In *The Principle of Authority*, P. T. Forsyth speaks to our present-day problem.

> I mean that in the Church attention should, perhaps, be occupied less with the questions of today, which enrich our platforms, and more with those of tomorrow, which take the lead in confidential groups; less with *effects* today and more with *results* tomorrow; less with the questions thrust forward by the journalists and more with those compelled by the Gospel; less with such questions as 'How to reach the masses' and more with certainty about 'What is to reach the masses'; less with social problems and more with questions like 'What makes a group a Church and keeps it so'; less with the prospects of the Church and more with the one foundation of a Church, if it have any; less with apologetic interests (on which no Church rests) and more with positive and dogmatic interests (on which alone the Church rests); less with the action of Christianity on the society it finds, and more with its action in the society which itself created . . . the supreme society of the Church, which is the ministers' first concern.

Only by coming back again and again, to the *what* of our Christian communication may we yield ourselves to the sovereign power of God the Holy Spirit and, therefore, insure that our 'Christian communication' remains Christian. The *what* of our communication, the Word of God, contains within itself the purifying, healing and sovereign power to convert the frenzied babelian nightmare of the web of communications into such creative silence that the demons of the world shall be still, and know that God is God.

Book Review Contributors

John Baillie is Harry Emerson Fosdick Visiting Professor . . . *Robert J. McCracken* is Minister of Riverside Church . . . *John C. Bennett* is Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics . . . *Reinhold Niebuhr* is Charles A. Briggs Graduate Professor of Ethics and Theology . . . *John A. Hutchison* is Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University . . . *James N. Gettemy* is Minister of the Garden City, L. I., Community Church . . . *Robert T. Handy* is Associate Professor of Church History . . . *M. Searle Bates* is Professor of Missions . . . *Charles R. Stinnette* is Associate Professor of Pastoral Theology and Associate Director of the Program in Religion and Psychiatry . . . *Robert Horn* is Tutor Assistant in Old Testament . . .*Tom F. Driver* is Instructor in Drama.

MINISTERS — AUTO DISPLAY PLATES
Made of steel; enamel finish. Glossy, durable.
Cross with word "Clergy." — 3 Styles
Emblem size 2¾" x 4¾"
A—Red Gothic Cross, Black Background
B—White Gothic Cross, Blue Background
C—White Gothic Cross, Red Background
Price: $3.50 per pair, postpaid.
CLERGY
87-613
Send today to—
Cross Emblem Co.
P.O. Box 1421 (Dept. U.S.)
Chicago 90, Illinois

Book Reviews

JOY IN BELIEVING, From the Spoken and Written Words and the Prayers of Henry Sloane Coffin. Ed. Walter Russell Bowie. *New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956. vii-248 pp., $2.95.*

I have listened to many preachers in my time whose great gifts could not be denied but who had, as it were, allowed these gifts to run away with them. They had the defects of their qualities. Henry Coffin was one of the few supremely gifted preachers of whom this could never be said. He was eloquent without being histrionic, fluent without being verbose, tender and moving without a trace of sentimentality, often daily ironic without ceasing to be gracious, often reproving but never scolding us. A couple of years ago I went in the company of a certain professor of homiletics to hear a preacher of whom everybody was talking and, as we came away, I said to my friend, "That man did every one of the things you have all your life been telling your students not to do!" Henry Coffin, however, not only avoided all these pitfalls but observed all the positive canons of the craft of homiletics—and did so with the art that conceals art. Though his sermons were full of vivid illustrations, these were not drawn from the preacher's common stock-in-trade, but very largely from experiences of his own—something he had observed in the woods or in the crowd, or perhaps some overheard conversation that had struck him as significant or revealing. Though his sermons were also rich in quotations, he drew these from his own reading, avoiding the obvious tags and tid-bits of the anthologists.

I never heard a sermon from Dr. Coffin that was not in the nature of a continuous argument, and therefore when I learned that a volume of the present kind was contemplated, I feared that it might prove difficult to select excerpts that could stand by themselves while at the same time conveying something of the impressiveness of the whole. I need have had no fears. Here are gems that shine most effectively in their own light. Dr. Bowie has proved himself a most skillful selector, and all Dr. Coffin's friends must be very grateful to him. If I have any criticism at all of his execution of this difficult task, it is that in one or two cases the sequence of thought is a little obscure because we are not given the text from which the sermon was preached. Why, for instance, on page seven does the preacher suddenly begin to make play with the word "Therefore"? I think it must have occurred in his text. But what was this text?

Not less remarkable than his preaching was Dr. Coffin's conduct of public worship. He made little use of traditional liturgies, but prepared prayers afresh for each occasion. I do not remember that he ever or often read these, preferring to rely on his wonderful verbal memory. But apparently they had all been most carefully written out, and here is a fine selection from them. Dr. Bowie has divided the sermon-excerpts into some fourteen groups and has added to each group a number of prayers germane to its general theme. They are very beautiful, arresting attention by the freshness of their phrasing and the unexpectedness of some of their petitions, yet they are all expressive of our universal needs and without any trace of idiosyncrasy—so that in listening to them or reading them we can all pray them for ourselves.

The book indeed has many of the marks of a devotional classic, and one hopes that it will be widely used as such. No doubt also numerous American (and other) congregations are destined to hear many of these excerpts expanded into full-length sermons in the course of the next few years!

JOHN BAILLIE

THE LIVING OF THESE DAYS, AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY BY HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK. *New York, Harper & Brothers, 1956. ix-324 pp., $4.00.*

This was a book that had to be written. Its author is by common consent one of the great prophetic voices of our time. All over Christendom men have learned to look to him for light and leading. Whatever he has turned his hand to, he has done superbly — a prince in the pulpit, a writer whose works have quickly taken ranks as best sellers, a broadcaster whose radio ministry has gone out to the ends of the earth and secured a hearing in the homes of millions of people. Having wielded such a far-reaching influence Dr. Fosdick owed it to himself and to his constituency, probably as large a constituency as any Christian minister has had in our day, to tell the story of his life, thought and work.

For ministers and candidates for the ministry this should be the book of the year. In the chapter *Learning to Preach* they will find what every man who occupies a pulpit craves—an opportunity at first hand of observing how a past master goes about the business of preaching. They will come upon a phrase—"clairvoyance into the needs of those to whom I spoke"—which uncovers one significant aspect of Dr. Fosdick's genius as a preacher. They will be provided with vivid reminders of the indispensable relation of wide reading to effective preaching, and at the same time of the way to avoid the bookish type of utterance which is divorced from life and concrete life-situations. Above all, they will be challenged by the discipline and dedication, the application and industry, the tireless capacity for taking pains, which are the *sine qua non* of sermon making.

Because every minister is a journeyman in theology the chapters on *The Fundamentalist Controversy* and *Winds of Doctrine* should be read, marked, learned and inwardly digested. Here is a liberal, reviewing in the eventide of his life the theological trends of the last fifty years, and as he analyzes and appraises them, unambiguously defining his own position. It is essentially a mediating position, a plea characterized by candor and charity to avoid extremes, to conserve the best insights of liberalism and to be receptive to the strengths, while not ignoring the weaknesses of, neo-orthodoxy. If only because of these two chapters the autobiography should rank in time to come as a historic document. In any event, for the day by day work of the minister they serve as proof of the fact that theological issues are

not the specialty of biblical scholars but the very stuff out of which preaching is made.

Furthermore, because every minister has to handle contemporary problems in the pulpit—war, racial discrimination, economic injustice—the chapter entitled *Ideas that Have Used Me* is certain to be rich in suggestion and direction. How does a pacifist preach to a world armed to the teeth? How does a wholehearted believer in racial integration present the Christian case for it? How does the minister of a church which it cost millions of dollars to build, a church cheek by jowl with Harlem and all that Harlem represents in sociological problems, justify to himself the cost of the building and the role he fills in relation to it? Questions like these Dr. Fosdick faces frankly and comes up with constructive answers that ministers everywhere, facing not dissimilar dilemmas, can weigh and ponder. To take one instance, where many clamor for quotation: "I thoroughly disapprove that type of pacifist who, concerned only with keeping his own skirts lily-white, retreats from the world's problems in wartime to a kind of monastic and irresponsible seclusion. From that sort of merely negative pacifism may the good Lord deliver us! But I did try (the reference is to his preaching during World War II) to keep the gospel of Jesus Christ from being degraded to the service of Mars, and I labored to foresee the kind of strategy, personal and governmental, that would make another war impossible." *Multum in parvo!* And the quotation is typical of what may be encountered on page after page of the twenty-seventh volume to come from the pen of the Minister Emeritus of The Riverside Church.

R. J. McCracken

CHURCH DOGMATICS, Vol. I The Doctrine Of The Word Of God (Prolegomena To Church Dogmatics) Part 2, by Karl Barth, Tr. G. T. Thomson and Harold Knight. *New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956. 905 pp., $12.50.*

[Ed. Note: *This review is one of a series which will deal with both this book and Barth's place in contemporary thought more generally. The subsequent reviews will be printed in the March and May issues.*]

There are at least three Barths. There is, first, the early Barth of the Commentary on Romans and of the essays published in this country under the title *The Word of God and the Word of Man.* Barth in that early stage did not plan to offer more than a "marginal note" to theology. He was a prophetic thinker who shook the theological world and caused most of Protestantism to change its course without often becoming Barthian. The second Barth is the one whom we find in this volume which has recently been translated into English. It is the Barth who has developed and refined a theological methodology based exclusively on the revelation of God in Christ. Although this volume is primarily a positive proclamation of the gospel, it provides the basis for Barth's polemical negative teaching about natural theology and related issues which caused the conflict with Brunner and which has created for most people in the English speaking world their only image of Barth. This theological methodology based exclusively on revelation remains Barth's way of working, but the results to which he has come are so surprising and so interesting that they overshadow these negative doctrines and should receive attention. They are what I call the third Barth. Barth still bases his theology upon Biblical exegesis but exegesis actually is the springboard for free and daring theological thought which leads Barth to very unconventional, perhaps "heretical," conclusions. Also they are

conclusions which provide an image of Barth which is in many ways the exact opposite of that which "Barthianism" represents to most Americans.

So far Barth has completed in German ten volumes. He calls each of them a part-volume. (This one is the second half of the first volume) The first half of the first volume was published in English in 1936. Each of these part-volumes is many hundred pages long—usually eight or nine hundred. In each volume there are scores of pages in fine print and these are often the most interesting because in them Barth develops his thought more concretely. In this volume there is in fine print, for example, a twenty eight page study of the Catholic conception of authority which is of absorbing interest. (pp 544-572). There is a team of Scotch scholars which is engaged in the translating of the other volumes.* It is their plan to publish two a year until *Church Dogmatics* is fully translated. Meanwhile we have two helpful books: Otto Weber's summary of the first eight volumes entitled *Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics* and G. C. Berkouwer's exposition of Barth's constructive theology under the title *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth.* I believe that the translation of these volumes means that the influence of Barth's thought upon American theology has just begun and that the result of this influence will have very little to do with what we have come to call "Barthianism." Instead we shall receive from him stimulation and illumination on most problems of theology and ethics and these will not depend upon the acceptance of the negative aspects of Barth's theological methodology.

In this second part of the first volume Barth develops fully his doctrine of revelation the main outlines of which are already familiar. He constantly emphasizes the sovereign freedom of God to reveal himself to men through Jesus Christ, and the uniqueness and finality of this revelation. He always criticizes the tendencies to distort and obscure this revelation in Catholicism, which subordinates it to the continuing voice of the Church, and in the "modernistic" tendencies in Protestant theology, which subordinate the revelation to religious experience or to general ideas of the philosophy of religion. The revelation in Christ validates itself or is validated by the witness of the Holy Spirit. It needs no support from rational arguments or from a broader religious witness. The Christological doctrines which are the foundation for this view of revelation are developed in this book. All Christological interpretations which undercut the full identification of God with the human figure of Jesus of Nazareth are rejected. Barth says: "Every question concerning the Word which is directed away from Jesus of Nazareth, the human being of Christ, is necessarily directed away from Himself, the Word, and therefore from God Himself, because the Word, and therefore God Himself, does not exist for us apart from the human being of Christ." (p. 166) The Virgin Birth and the bodily resurrection are strongly affirmed and yet Barth has such a sophisticated view of the historical problems related to what he calls "saga" in the Bible that one is left wondering what he means by these affirmations. He rejects Bultmann's program of "demythologization" but he seems to have something of an equivalent that leaves his views uncertain.

Readers who cannot fully accept Barth's doctrine of revelation and the absolute exclusiveness of the claims which surround it can learn a great deal from his teaching about the authority of scripture and the relation of that authority to the Church and to the individual believer. He presents a full length Protestant doctrine of authority which is extraordinarily impressive. He

**This team includes Professor Torrance whose illuminating article on Barth was published in the November issue of this journal.*

is, of course, no Fundamentalist. He does not identify the Word of God with the words of the Bible. The prophets and apostles are witnesses to the revelation. The critical study of the Bible is necessary though its results are not greatly emphasized. The fact that we have the written record of the witness of the prophets and apostles enables us to be related to the original revelation. If the Church were not always under the guidance of the scriptures it would be able to make the revelation over in its own image but the perpetual dialogue between the Church and the Bible provides the necessary corrective.

Barth's view of the revealing act of God in Christ, mediated to us through the Scriptures in the Church, is remarkably dynamic. God speaks a fresh word to us by this means. The believer today has surprising freedom. He should listen to the Word in company with the Church. He should take the earlier interpretations of the Church seriously but they are not final for him. He should listen to the Fathers, especially the Fathers of the Reformation, but he must still respond freely today under the guidance of the Spirit. Barth insists that the Canon is not closed and this seems to mean that in the future some Biblical books might be eliminated from the Canon, as the Apochrypha was eliminated by the Reformation, and that some new discovery, perhaps "in the sands of Egypt" as he says, might add a new apostolic book. No Confession of the Church, and no system of theology, is final.

I believe that some of the negative aspects of Barth's doctrine of revelation, especially his rejection of "general revelation," are mistaken. What I have called the "second Barth" of the absolute methodology is unlikely to excite or persuade many readers among American Protestants. But the third Barth, the Barth who uses the theological freedom for which he provides in this book, and who has become dominant in most of the remaining volumes of his great *Dogmatic* will often excite and sometimes persuade because he brings great learning and extraordinary interpretative genius to bear on every theological and ethical problem. Barth himself would doubtless reject such a distinction between the second and third Barth but he will have to allow us to think about Barth as freely as he thinks about everything else.

As for the Barth of this volume, I see in him, in spite of all criticisms of his negative doctrines, a powerful witness to essential Christian truth.

JOHN C. BENNETT

GOWNS
PULPIT • CHOIR
Satisfaction in Every Stitch since 1912

SUPERIOR
WORKMANSHIP
•
QUALITY FABRICS
•
PERFECT FIT
GUARANTEED

Write for catalog D-45

BENTLEY & SIMON INC
7 WEST 36 ST • NEW YORK 18, N.Y.

REASON AND EXISTENZ, BY KARL JASPERS, TR. WILLIAM EARLE. *New York, The Noonday Press, 1955. 157 pp., $3.50.*

CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY, BY FREDERICK COPLESTON, S. J. *London, Burns & Oates, 1956. ix-230 pp., 18/-.*

These two books, of which Father Copleston's appeared only this summer, have much in common both in matter and in method. I would like to dwell upon their affinities.

As to matter, Prof. Jaspers' *Reason and Existenz,* which was published last year, gives us a most illuminating account of the possibilities and limits of comprehending the meaning of life through reason. Jaspers is usually defined as an existentialist and so he is. But this is no existentialist polemic against the rationalists. It is rather a careful analysis of what reason can do and can not do. Reason can analyse all the finite structures and relationships in the world and in man. It can analyse man insofar as he can make himself an object of inquiry; but it can not analyse that part of man which is subject rather than object.

Jaspers is prompted to his analysis by the thought of two nineteenth century thinkers, who, in his opinion, have altered the whole philosophical climate of our era: Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. Both of these men saw the limits of the rational. The one was an atheist and the other the founder of a new school of existentialist Christian philosophy. Jaspers rightly believes that their different solutions for confronting the transcendent mystery do not obscure the similarity of their thought. The one found meaninglessness beyond the bounds of rational intelligibility and thought that life could have meaning only as the individual heroicially imparted meaning to it. Thus a modern atheistic existentialist, like Sarte, has more affinities with Nietzsche than with Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard, of course, believes that the final clue to the ultimate meaning is given in the revelation in Christ. Jaspers suggests that Kierkegaard's faith is a rather desperate one, for he regards despair as the proper and necessary prelude to the leap of faith. This interpretation is plausible if one reads only the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* but it does not fit the picture of the serene faith which Kierkegaard expresses in his devotional writings and in his prayers (recently published in English translation by the Chicago University Press).

Jaspers has an aversion to the positive meaning which any "revealed religion" gives to the transcendent mystery, including the affirmations of Christianity. He is content to speak of "the Transcendent" but he feels rather firmly that this is a dimension of freedom which lies beyond the competence of reason. The non-polemical character of Jaspers work, his willingness to take account of various viewpoints and to measure the legitimacy of various methods in philosophy, make him one of the most persuasive of "existentialists" and prove that he is something more than an existentialist. He is illuminating for Christians even when he falls short of the Christian faith.

Father Copleston's *Contemporary Philosophy* is a triumph of the same mood of non-polemical philosophical analysis. Copleston's Thomistic faith does not prevent him from giving a very fair and illuminating account of both logical analysis—even of its frequent consequence of logical positivism—and of existentialism, from Kierkegaard to Sartre. Copleston points out that the principles of logical analysis are older than the present movement and have been observed whenever philosophers have examined linguistic propositions to determine what men really meant when they made this or that assertion He is inclined to set great store on the achievements of logical analysis but to discount the logical positivism which results when verifia-

bility according to the methods of the natural sciences is regarded as the only test of truth. He holds this kind of naturalism to be a natural product of the ethos of our technocratic age. Copleston analyses the thought of Kierkegaard, Marcel, Heidegger, Jaspers and the modern French atheists Camus and Sartre. He calls attention to the confusion in Heidegger's thought due to his insistance that he is engaged primarily in ontological analysis. The thought of Jaspers is favored, and Sartre's existentialism is proved to be a dubious assertion of the freedom of man without an adequate appreciation of the determining factors. Copleston finds both existentislists and "personalists" of the school of Mournier too individualistic and not sufficiently aware of the necessity for community in the life of the individual. This is certainly true of Kierkegaard. Copleston thinks Jaspers is also guilty of this error despite his emphasis on communication. In his criticism of Jaspers Copleston may be mistaken, but he is right about existentialism in general whether of the pious or atheistic variety. It is inclined to disregard all aspects of personality but those which completely transcend the community. It is critical of bourgeois life but it has inherited a burgeois individualism.

Copleston proves beyond doubt that a non-polemical philosophical treatise need not be non-commital but may be, on the contrary, very effective in presenting the author's essential faith because of his fair presentation of the positions which he discards. It also demonstrates how an intelligent Catholic wrestles with the problems of a secular culture with a sense of responsibility about which Barth, for instance, knows nothing.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

THE COMMUNICATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH, BY HENDRICK KRAEMER. *Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956. 128 pp., $2.50.*

This book is an expression of its author's wide and varied interests in the problem of communication as it relates to the Christian faith. Its contents comprise the Laidlaw Lectures given at Knox College, Toronto, last year; and it is also fair to add that one detects in many of the paragraphs the experience of the director of the Ecumenical Institute of the World Council of Churches. Dr. Kraemer's viewpoint is a felicitous combination of a deep attachment to Biblical faith and a wise and flexible evaluation of the many problems of culture relating to the communication of that faith.

It is perhaps important to note in passing what this book is not. It is not a treatise in philosophical theology dealing in Tillichian fashion with the symbolic character of Christian faith. Rather, assuming the fundamental importance of communication to Christian faith, it deals alike with such theological problems as the relation of communication to the communion of man with God, or of the communion of Christians in the *koinonia*, and with the practical problems of how the faith is best to be communicated to men of the contemporary world.

The first chapter deals with communication in the Biblical perspective. Attention is called to the idea of a God who speaks to men, to a community of believers, the *koinonia*, and to the participation of language in both man's fall and his renewal. The tower of Babel is suggested as a symbol of the disruption of language and communication by human sin. "Language, the typical symbol of unity and communication amongst men, the instrument to meet each other, becomes the source of misunderstanding, disruption and deceit." (p. 19). While Kraemer does not use the example, can we not see illustrations

of this same pervasive human tendency in the use of language alike for propaganda and for rationalization? Kraemer also indicates important traits of language in the Biblical perspective, its categorical or imperative nature, and also to view that the "primary author of the effective transmission of the message is the Holy Spirit." (p. 28). As Christians we are called to proclaim a message of which God is the author. Kraemer is, however, entirely clear that the Christian message is never adequately expressed in the categories of any particular theology.

Passing from the Bible to Christian history, Kraemer comments on many of the forms of communication in changing periods of history. In the ancient world the fundamental problem was the proclamation of a New Reality which required and produced a new language and a new style. The ancient world also produced the vexed question of Christianity and culture. How far if at all might a Christian participate in the processes of pagan culture? A single facet of this complex phenomenon was the language of apologetics with its attempts to bridge the gap between faith and culture.

The decree of Constantine opened a new age in which the language of dogma, anathema, refutation and excommunication became the normative facts of Christian behavior. Kraemer deplores the failure of communication and the consequent liquidation of heretics, schismatics and deviants. Rather as he argues, "the perennial problem of missions is that of communication." (p. 50). Simultaneously within the church the "living transmission of the Biblical faith" was exchanged for the "transmissal of the body of revealed verities combined with a strategy of adaptation and assimilation in a new cultural and spiritual environment."

Moving to the contemporary scene, Kraemer has many wise observations alike on the nature of Christian faith and the cultural situation to which the faith must be communicated. As to the former, he consistently assumes that Christians must move from correct theology to living Biblical faith. As to the latter, there are in the book several explications of the general breakdown of communication in the modern world. As a part of this breakdown, Kraemer discusses the process of secularization of the modern world. However, he is far from believing secularization to be an unmitigated evil. Actually these are great gains, if only Christians have the wisdom to see the situation fully.

The books ends with a discussion of the restoration of communication. Properly and theologically speaking this restoration is an eschatological concept, yet as Kraemer points out, prior to Judgment Day Christians may surely concern themselves alike directly with problems of effective evangelism and indirectly with the nature and means of communicating the Gospel.

While this volume lacks any new or startling ideas, it does consist of the wise observations of a devout and shrewd man on a problem of pressing contemporary interest.

JOHN A. HUTCHISON

MODERN RIVALS TO CHRISTIAN FAITH, BY CORNELIUS LOEW. *Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956. 96 pp., $1.00.*

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CHURCH, BY ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN. *Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956. 96 pp., $1.00.*

THE CHRISTIAN MAN, BY WILLIAM HAMILTON. *Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956. 93 pp., $1.00.*

BELIEVING IN GOD, BY DANIEL JENKINS. *Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956. 94 pp., $1.00.*

The Laymen's Theological Library is a worthy venture not only because of the quality of the four books which have appeared already, but also because of the timeliness of the undertaking. For the current return to religion is marked by a return to the Church as well, which has not been true of all religious revivals. This places upon the Church, especially upon its ministry, the responsibility to see to it that those who come find an authentic, relevant presentation of the Christian faith. Central in this presentation is worship wherein the gift and demand of the Gospel is unequivocally set forth. Simultaneously, however, a teaching ministry must be carried on for twentieth century catechumens. For such a teaching ministry *The Laymen's Theological Library* is a valuable tool.

The value of this tool will be increased if these books are read and discussed by small groups, at least one of whose members is familiar with the "similar convictions which the authors share about the uniqueness of the Christian faith." To circulate these books in a parish simply saying, "Take and read," would be folly. We stumble in Barth's "strange new world of the Bible" which these authors know and would have us know. Their books are good travelers' manuals, but much more meaningful if a personal guide who has been over the route before is along to interpret. Both Loew's and Brown's books illustrate the necessity of this guided study, for each endeavors in a few pages to encompass Christian doctrine, in chapters on "The Tradition within the Traditions" and "1517 and All That," respectively. In avoiding the danger which they feared of insulting the laymen's intelligence, they have published books which must be accompanied by a minister! Nonetheless, when these books are the basis of the teaching ministry, as three of them have been in the congregation of which this reviewer is a member, they do achieve their purpose: "to remind the layman that he is a theologian."

As theologian, the layman has something to say to theologian Loew. The Modern Rivals to Christian Faith, the author contends, are primarily science, democracy and patriotism. They are idols, to be sure, but haven't they passed their prime? A mopping-up action still may be needed for these pretenders to the throne, but no longer are they *the enemy*. Is not the modern rival to Christian faith the bitch-goddess, Success? Is not this the alternative to Christian faith in American life? Beneath the shadow of Success the other idols stand or fall—magic is as quickly employed as science, and one will be a frantic internationalist if patriotism does not pay in the world of trade. Literally: "Nothing succeeds like Success." We live in an economy of abundance when the model and number of one's cars become the symbol of accomplishment or failure, when more persons than ever before are achieving Success. Is not this today's idol whose noisy devotees cannot hear of One who began his ministry saying: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has annointed me to preach good news to the poor"?

Though in the first half of his book Professor Loew makes no mention of Success as the idol which commands our loyalty, commitment, devotion, in his discussion of idolatry "inside Christianity" he does recognize it. It is sug-

gested in the title of one chapter, "Making-the-most-of-yourself Christianity." It is stated specifically in the content of another: "Dr. Peale's message is dominated by the success religion of our modern culture." (p. 58). Since this book's readers will be largely from within the Christian community, one is grateful the author has pointed out the idol within our own household. The same idol must be unmasked as the chief rival to the Christian faith outside the Church.

General Editor Brown's book is not only Scriptural in content, but also in organization—if a little heterodox in style! This last is true not only when the author writes under his pseudonym —Saint Hereticus—but also when he writes as Professor Brown: for example, the description of the cocktail party as a secularized version of The Lord's Supper. But this distinctive—and, for many, refreshing—style makes this particular volume the most readable in the series so far. It is an immense advantage in a book of less than 100 pages which seeks to give a Genesis to Revelation coverage of the Church historically, doctrinally and (just to make this review respectable) existentially! The opening chapter, "A Long Hard Look at the Church," is truly existential. The case against and for the Church, both by those without and within, is vividly stated, A. D. 1956. Inevitably, every reader finds expressed somewhere in these opening pages his own attitudes toward the Church. Because he does, he is disposed to stay with the author through the next two chapters of Church history, which preface a chapter on Church doctrine. These three chapters, although well written, are not easily read. "Protestant laymen," says Professor Brown, "must make an effort to understand their heritage." Amen. We are indebted to the author for having reviewed this heritage so comprehensively and so lucidly in these chapters. Yet, despite his accomplishment, unless these chapters are shared by two or three gathered together in Christ's name, the understanding will not be reached. "Justification by Faith," "The Priesthood of All Believers," "The Doctrine of the 'Calling'" must be "talked out" as well as written out. Finally, to be fully understood, they must be lived out. The teaching ministry of the Church must be in community.

If it is necessary to discuss in community the first half of *The Significance of the Church* in order to be sure what the author is saying about the Church, it is desirable to discuss the last half so that the reader may be aware of what *he* has been saying about the Church. For the laymen's vagueness about Church history and doctrine has been no deterrent to his unwarranted dogmatism about the Roman Catholic Church, the right way of corporate worship and the role of the Church in politics. In successive chapters on these topics, Professor Brown compels the layman to listen to the superficiality of what he has been saying by contrasting it with the more adequate understanding of the Church's nature which is rooted in its history and doctrine. *The Significance of the Church* is a significant book about the Church which has, in one congregation at least, gotten "people thinking about the Church in Reformation terms." Since it does this, and for other reasons as well, we can have hope the Reformation will continue.

The Christian Man is William Hamilton's forthright exposition of the Christian view of man as forgiven sinner. This understanding of ourselves is derived from encounter with Christ who first "comes judging our imperfect and compromising manhood." (p. 35). If the critical encounter issues in contrition, then we find forgiveness in Christ. We are forgiven sinners. This is sound Christian doctrine. Is it persuasively presented? Would the laymen, for whom this book presumably is written, admit on the basis of this presentation that

to be a Christian man is to be a forgiven sinner? To raise this question is not to imply that modern man is not worrying about his sins and therefore can never know himself as forgiven sinner. The issue is: How does he reach that understanding? Should not these books which "attempt a fresh exploration of the Christian faith and what it can mean in the life of a twentieth century man" start afresh with modern man? Should not the "starting point" be the laymen's awareness of his insecurity despite boasted security, of his anxiety despite flaunted self-confidence, of his loneliness despite apparent fellowship? Those to whom this book is addressed are vulnerable at this point. The traditional presentation in section one of *The Christian Man* may be by-passed.

Professor Hamilton's discussion of "Man and His Body" in the second section of the book does start with us where we are. "It is an attempt to use something we all share, sexuality and its problems, as a guide to understanding the Christian view of man." (p. 45). His chapter on "The Goodness of the Body" is an urgently-needed corrective to the "spiritual" view of man usually regarded by laymen as "the Christian view." The remaining two chapters in this section are an attempt to defend premarital chastity and to do so in the light of the Christian understanding of man. Actually these chapters seem to deny the Christian view of man as forgiven sinner. The sexual act within marriage is viewed too simply as good. "Doesn't it portray a most complete and radical kind of self-giving — complete commitment of one to the other, concern only for the other and not for the self?" (p. 62). The sexual act outside marriage is viewed too simply as bad. Is it as impossible, as the author's defense of chastity implies, for the life of the body and the heart to be one outside marriage? There should be incorporated in this section on "Man and His Body" the insights found in the concluding chapters and suggested in their titles: "We Are Not Self-Sufficient," "Egoism and Humility," "Forgiveness Again." Then section two would make clear that sexuality is not sin, that we all sin in sex, and that our "only righteousness . . . is one that springs from forgiveness." (p. 42). Awakened to the true nature and pervasiveness of sin in this one area of his life, the layman could reread section one with new understanding. He then might know that it is as a forgiven man that he is the Christian man.

Daniel Jenkins' *Believing in God* is a closely-reasoned presentation of the reasons, non-Christian and Christian, for belief in God. It is, as well, a penetrating examination of the obstacles to faith, real and concocted, both before and after the Christian revelation. And it is a summons to the venture of faith in the face of the mysterious nature of life and God, a mystery of which the Biblical writers are always aware but which modern man often denies.

The ministry has often expressed concern that the Church has lost the intellectual, though the greater concern should be that the intellectual is lost without the Church. However one looks at it, Jenkins' book can be given without hesitancy to the intellectual as a good apology for the faith.

The brevity of the review of this fourth book to appear in the series suggests the strength and weakness of *The Laymen's Theological Library* as a whole. It is a theological library. It is doctrinally sound. To employ a figure, the authors are rowing in the main stream of Christian faith and rowing well. This is the theological library's strength. But it is also a laymen's library. The authors' purpose is to take aboard their sound and purposeful craft the increasing numbers who line the banks. These are "tired businessmen," "tired farmers," "tired housewives." The authors have not abandoned their boats and simply mingled on shore. But

likewise, with rare exception, they have failed to put into shore and pick up any passengers. This is the laymen's library's weakness. Perhaps it is also the pastor's excuse for existence. On speaking terms with both the rowers and those on the banks, he may be able to lead some of the latter into the stream and coax some of the rowers a little nearer shore.

JAMES N. GETTEMY

THE SOCIAL THOUGHT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, BY EDWARD DUFF, S. J. *New York, Association Press, 1956. xii-340 pp., $7.50.*

Early in this remarkable book, Father Duff speaks of his problems as author, saying, "To him, as a Catholic priest, the theological approach of, say, Lutheranism or contemporary Barthianism represents a different tradition, making particular demands upon his understanding. He has, however, striven —such indeed is the whole purpose of this study—to comprehend clearly and to report faithfully his understanding of the different traditions influencing the common attitudes and general policy of the World Council of Churches on the social problems engaging its attention" (pp. 10 f.). His purpose has been well fulfilled in a competent, illuminating, and comprehensive way. The work begins with a compact survey of ecumenical history through Evanston, followed by an analysis of the nature and authority of the World Council. The writer explains that of the two tendencies within the Ecumenical Movement (a search for the unity of the churches, and for the social consequences of religious truth), he is concerned with the second—with life and work, rather than with faith and order. Hence, he insists several times, this is not a theological study. Formally, it isn't. But in explicating the social thought of, the World Council he carefully examines the underlying theological tensions, notably those between an "ethic of inspiration" and an "ethic of ends," which are rooted in differing concepts of the Church (Protestant versus Catholic). Therefore the book actually has in it much more theology than some specifically theological books; in many ways it is a significant contribution to the history of recent Protestant theology.

The major part of the study, which was a dissertation at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, is a survey of the social philosophy and social policy of the World Council, handled with genuine objectivity and fine insight. Council actions, statements, and debates dealing with the economic order, political institutions, and international developments are skillfully surveyed. Council stands on such matters as the United Nations, racial segregation, Stalinism, international law, and many other topics, are delineated. But this never becomes a mere compilation of facts and quotations. Not only are the theological backgrounds of the positions dealt with, but such considerations as the role of leaders and the impact of historical crises are included. Also, the author does not hesitate to make judgments of his own, both in criticism and in commendation. For example, he can make such comments as these: "The treatment of the subject of 'capitalism' at Amsterdam, because of its omissions and imprecision, must be deemed less than satisfactory." "Much of the imprecision of World Council pronouncements, it would appear, is a result of a failure to examine concrete political and economic institutions at close hand" (pp. 207, 298 f.). But the balance of his judgments is strongly positive. Among his conclusions, to pick a few at random, are these: "The organized Ecumenical Movement, has, by

its pronouncements and its common action, made a distinct contribution to contemporary social thought whose importance should not be neglected. . . . It has, by its existence and activities, reminded national political authorities and international agencies of the motivation and the existence of programmes of social assistance of crucial importance which they are inclined to forget. . . . And in potentially its most effective action the World Council's Second Assembly condemned any form of segregation and called on its member churches to work for its abolition everywhere" (pp. 304-6).

Inevitably in such a massive undertaking, a few slips have been made. For instance, the late Professor Clarence Tucker Craig is made to hold a position which he specifically denied, and had just one more sentence of Dean Craig's been quoted, this would have been abundantly clear (p. 143, cf. Richardson & Schweitzer [eds.], *Biblical Authority for Today*, p. 43). And, even for a dissertation, there are altogether too many footnotes. Indeed, some of the most interesting material falls in them, so that the reader often feels that he is covering several books at once, his attention to the text is so often interrupted.

This study has a special interest for the Union Seminary family, for a number of our Faculty and Alumni have played significant roles in the story here told. But it is of general interest for all who are concerned either with the Ecumenical Movement or with contemporary Protestant social thought. It will immediately take a leading place in the literature of ecumenicity.

ROBERT T. HANDY

THE CHURCH IN SOVIET RUSSIA, BY MATTHEW SPINKA. *New York, Oxford University Press, 1956. xi-179 pp., $3.25.*

It is part of the very situation in Russia that not even a general description or survey, still less an analytical study, and least of all a prophetic cry from within, can come to us. We have travelers' snapshots, compilations of the published acts of the regime against and toward the churches, efforts to reflect and to understand printed communist ideology in its bearing on religion, and occasional combinations of these latter two elements with the talents of Anderson, Timasheff, or Curtiss.

Spinka makes a distinctive, if limited, contribution by examining the relations of the Russian Orthodox Church to the Orthodox Communist State, in terms of the Patriarchs Tikhon (1917-1925), Sergei (1926-1944), and Alexei (1944 —), who through critical vicissitudes have wrestled in their grievous subordination from 1918 until now, striving to hold for the Church some room to breathe if not to move. This definition of subject includes a fair part of what we know about Church policy, top leadership, and organization. It does not deal significantly with the spirit and the life, which we assume to be present in the maintenance of worship, the continuance of millions in baptism and church marriage, acceptance of priestly responsibility, and voluntary contributions. Spinka does, however, indicate the ninefold decimation (1918-1940) of clergy and of functioning parish churches, and the uncertain figures of rally since then; and, a Slav and a church historian, he professes his faith that the religion of the Russian people survives now, as under the Tsars, in spite of the politically conditioned hierarchy.

Although the early Bolshevik regime had a poor expectancy of life, and the Church by manifold circumstance was set in rigorous defensive opposition, even the Tikhon who literally anathe-

matized the despoilers of the status, the functions, and the properties of the Church, ordering believers "not to commune with such outcasts of the human race in any manner whatsoever," was forced within a year to humble himself and the Church in the effort to preserve the minimum fragment of autonomy and integrity. He and the stubborn laity won a long, hard fight against schism and seizure of central administration by revolutionary priests whom the police supported. But, himself a prisoner like most of the faithful bishops, Tikhon could do this only by renouncing resistance to the overall program of the regime, saving the inner citadel of church worship.

It was left to Sergei to gain, in 1927, an opportunity to draw together the disintegrated Church. Prison and the wholesale exiling of hierarchs toned down his valiant efforts to affirm the independence of the Church in terms spiritual, explicitly not political; and he was driven to pledge active loyalty in the familiar identification of the Church with the nation—which later was now so fully subsumed in the Communist system. In the 30's the Stalin policy irregularly favored nationalism, with the Church as one of its constituents. by anticipation of the Hitler war. During the crisis of invasion the loyal devotion of leaders and followers of the Church won further relaxations, not cancellations, of restrictive decrees.

Alexei, a man with more signs of ambition and fewer of piety than his two predecessors, began as a cooperator with Stalin, to be ostentatiously recognized as Patriarch and used, not unwillingly, to assert Russian primacy over all the Orthodox in East Europe and the Levant, even unto Paris and the Americas; and to develop the breeding of Picasso pigeons as cover for Russian planes. The Pan-Orthodox Conference of 1948, which tried to put Moscow in the column of historic Ecumenical Councils, heard the World Council of Churches reviled as manipulated and moneyed by Mott the 'Mason-Methodist', in order to establish 'a Universal Protestant collective Vatican.' (Certain journals which follow this latter line may prefer a variant by the same dignitary on the same occasion, 'Riverside Church and Wall Street.') Nevertheless, Spinka's documents and narrative contain convincing evidence of courage and faith within the hard-pressed redoubts of the Russian Church. Unfortunately, the evidence is less clearly manifest for the recent decade than it was before 1945.

M. Searle Bates

PSYCHIATRY AND THE BIBLE, by Carroll Wise. *New York, Harper and Brothers, 1956. xi-169 pp., $3.00.*

Above the heads of many broadcasters out of London in the Second World War was the sober question, "Is what you are saying worth a man's risking his life to hear?" We may be thankful that the outpouring of words and books today involves less risk. But surely the question is a healthy reminder to every author. Carroll Wise, out of his experience as a pastoral counselor and teacher, has something worthwhile to say—even if it involved risk. We may have qualms about the title, *Psychiatry and the Bible,* and we may wish that the exciting new depths in Biblical theology had been brought to this conversation between the two disciplines, but we certainly can accept with gratitude the distillation of psychiatric theory and practice which are related to Biblical themes in this book.

Throughout this book the author interprets the Biblical material in the light of psychiatry's discovery of the kind of relationships which foster man's fullest creativity and love. Indeed the word *relationship* is at the core of every discussion. The fact that in the Bible there is a movement from the handling of guilt and forgiveness in terms of law to one of relationship appears to be a reflection of the common resolution of problems in psychiatry and in the Bible. But appearances are deceptive! Martin Buber is reminding us today that relationship is at the heart of the Ten Commandments. But it is not just any relationship, however healthy. Obedience to Law grows out of relationship to the living God who gives the Law. It is not surprising that psychiatric inquiry which deals with empirical man in the process of becoming should discover that relationship is crucial. Nor is it unusual that the outcome of Biblical religion should be expressed in terms of personal relation. But the motive in each case should not be blurred or obscured: in one it is human effort and understanding and in the other it is the activity of God and human response.

The effort "to relate the insights of the Bible to the recent findings of psychology and medicine" is an effort which begins with a handicap. Biblical theology is forcefully reminding us that the Bible cannot be extracted into propositions, or even insights. If one sets out with an extracted view of psychiatry or the Bible, it is unlikely that he will come to grips with the living, concrete reality of encounter. The God of the Bible is known in action. He meets us in and through event. Carroll Wise is a Christian and as a pastoral counselor knows this, I am sure. But the characters of the Bible, even the people whom the author describes, are pale reflections of real people here. Peter's conversion is a "change of attitudes and goals" and poor old Judas just had "not worked through his attitudes to the point where acceptance of Christ's acceptance was possible"! All that the author is saying may be true, but the Bible deserves a more disciplined approach in terms of its own integrity. It is quite possibly true that the prodigal son in his depths decided that "the answer lay in a new kind of relationship with his father", but his action was instant and the compulsion which drew him home again had time for only one word, "Abba, father!"

However one feels about the method and approach of this book, he will find here a rich fare for health and Biblical religion. The author is a skillful counselor as well as a good pastor. He has long interpreted religious symbols in terms of an intrinsic relation between symbol and act symbolized wherein "seeing" is more than logical awareness. His explanation of faith as "a basic orientation that involves emotional acceptance of and response to, a person whom one knows as dependable, reliable and trustworthy" is further evidence of the fruit of years spent in clinical work and pastoral care. *Psychiatry and the Bible* opens a field of fruitful endeavor for students of both fields.

C. R. Stinnette, Jr.

ISRAEL AND REVELATION, by Eric Voegelin. Volume I of *Order and History. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Louisiana State University Press, 1956. 515 pp., $7.50.*

Israel and Revelation is a book which deserves the careful attention of theologian, philosopher, historian, and preacher alike. It is a work of vast scholarship, penetrating insight, and genuine literary skill. In the field of Old Testament scholarship it brings to the attention of American readers the valuable work of such German and Scandinavian scholars as von Rad, Alt, Eichrodt, Noth,

Engnell, Mowinckel, Nyberg and Widengren. In the field of the philosophy and history of political order *Israel and Revelation* enters into vital conversation with Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History*. The felicitousness of the author's language will make itself felt to any who have struggled through the rewarding but often barbarous verbiage of many contemporary writers.

The present volume is the first in a projected series of six volumes in which Dr. Voegelin plans to treat the "symbolic forms" of Western thought from their emergence in the Middle East to the nineteenth century and the problems of order arising from the earth-wide expansion of Western civilization. Volume one examines the civilizations of Mesopotamia and Egypt with their "cosmic-divine" locus of political order and the "historical" locus of order in Israel. The remaining five volumes by the author, who is Boyd Professor of Government at Louisiana State University, are set for publication over the next two years. Volume two of the series will examine Greece and the world of the *polis*, volume three the thought of Plato and Aristotle, volume four the Roman Empire and Christianity, and volumes five and six, "The Protestant Centuries" and "The Crisis of Western Civilization". The author's efforts in the first volume have produced a work which displays thorough acquaintance with the archeological and documentary sources, a careful sifting of the scholarly interpretations of these materials, and a balanced judgment which the reader must respect, even when he disagrees with it. This review can do little more than set out the methodological assumptions of Voegelin's work. It will have failed should it substitute itself for the reading of the book.

The orientation of the thought of Eric Voegelin is most readily seen in contrast with the better-known view of Toynbee. Voegelin finds the Spengler-Toynbee theory of civilizational cycles especially unusual when one considers that a historian supposedly relates the past of mankind to a meaningful present. "Why should a thinker," he asks, "be concerned about history at all, if apparently it is his purpose to show that there are no meaningful presents, but only typical, recurrent situations and responses? This apparent oddity will . . . become intelligible as an expression of the tension between the Judeo-Christian historical form, in which Western civilization still exists, and the loss of substance which it has suffered." (p. 133). Spengler and Toynbee, Voegelin asserts, see civilizations as mystical entities which *produce* such cultural phenomena as myths, religions, arts and sciences. This view is attacked vigorously: ". . . experiences of order, as well as their symbolic expressions, are not products of a civilization but its constitutive forms." (p. 126) We are told, e. g., not to look for the genius who is the "founder" of a religion but for communities of men who live under particular orders discovered as true. For the civilizations of Mesopotamia and Egypt this order was a mundane imitation of the cosmic order itself. For Israel order meant an Exodus from civilization, an Exodus which has created the peculiar problems of the relation of the people of God to civilization which have plagued Judaism and Christianity ever since. The Exodus involved a "leap in being", the discovery of the true order of mankind in the will of a transcendent God. It is with the assumption of the "ontological reality" of this event and the consequent beginning of existence in historical form that Voegelin starts. The Bible thus appears, as it cannot for Toynbee, as the legitimate product of a new understanding of existence. Narrative on this level has replaced myth on the level of cosmological civilization. The study of Israel's history presents unique problems created by the initial emergence of "historical form" (the present under God creating both memory and hope) in human thought.

It is with this uniqueness that Toynbee refuses to deal.

Israel and Revelation has earned for itself a place on the bookshelves of all who are concerned with the meaning of history, with the problems of myth and symbol and with the most recent findings of Old Testament scholarship. In all of these areas it is one of the most challenging books published in recent years.

ROBERT L. HORN

GREAT CHRISTIAN PLAYS, ED. THEODORE M. SWITZ AND ROBERT JOHNSTON. *Greenwich, Conn., The Seabury Press, 1956. 306 pp. $7.50.*

This volume is apparently intended to fill the gap which has existed since Phillips E. Osgood's *Old Time Church Drama Adapted* (New York, 1928) went out of print. That was for many years the stand-by to which not a few churches turned to find versions of Medieval plays suitable for amateur production.

The ambitious editors have attempted not only to present five Medieval texts in actable form but also to provide detailed cues for direction, costuming, and make-up, as well as to include program notes, original music, and an appendix of materials for choral reading. Of the plays selected, *Abraham and Isaac* (Brome) and *Everyman* are often printed now, while the York *Resurrection,* the Digby *Conversion of St. Paul,* and *Totentanz* are less readily accessible.

The book suffers from trying to tailor its material too closely to the needs of the imagined typical parish. The plays chosen are undoubtedly beyond the reach of the director with no experience, although the detailed "suggestions" seem to pre-suppose none. In any case, it is better to leave the director and actor some scope for the imagination rather than to indicate every move on the stage. The desire to be practical has led to such impracticalities as this ancient delusion: "And if time and money do not permit much, there are always bed sheets, window draperies, and bed-spreads that can be draped around the actors into the traditional Biblical costumes." That way lies churchly boredom!

Great Christian Plays, beautifully bound and done up with much care, has over-extended itself. The cost is too high, and the volume too bulky, for its use as an acting copy. Although it was not intended for him, it will be of most use to the director who already has experience enough to pick and choose, and to be independent of many of the specifics set down. I found its best discovery to be selections from the Gospel of John arranged for choral and congregational reading (although without the incidental music, please).

TOM F. DRIVER

Book Notes

THE THEOLOGY OF CALVIN, WILHELM NIESEL, TR. HAROLD KNIGHT. *Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956. 254 pp., $4.00.*

The publishers say that "some revision of the original text has been made by the author for this English edition" of a book first published in 1938. As far as I can tell, this "revision" consists chiefly in the addition to the bibliographical references of a very few titles of works dealing with Calvin that have appeared since 1938. Substantially this English translation presents the original book. One of its chief characteristics was then and still is that it was written with no regard for Calvin studies in the English speaking countries. The bibliographies refer almost entirely to German writings and a few French and Dutch ones, chiefly of the twenties and thirties. In so far as Calvin-research is concerned, this book is therefore provincial and at the same time dated. But this weakness is not as significant as it may seem to be. For in his exposition of Calvin's Theology, the author is not greatly interested in the theses of the interpreters, except in so far as he battles against the tendency of some of them to find the key to the understanding of Calvin's thought in certain special doctrines, *e.g.*, predestination. He feels that Calvin designed his theology as an exposition of God's revelation in Christ, *e. g.*, that it was Christocentric through and through. One can hardly quarrel with this idea; but it is not very illuminating simply because of the fact that every Christian theology must be basically Christocentric; otherwise it would not be Christian. Moreover, Niesel has some difficulty in showing that Calvin was as consistently Christocentric as he wants to have him be. In his exposition of the doctrines of predestination the law and the order of the church he must resort to special pleading in order to maintain his thesis.

Generally speaking, the book is a careful, balanced resumé of Calvin's teaching, based mainly, but not exclusively, on the *Institutes*. It is almost entirely expository on the silent assumption that Calvin's thought does not require historical criticism in order to be as intelligible in 1956 (or rather 1938) as it was in 1559.

WILHELM PAUCK

HISTORY OF THE WORLD'S ALLIANCE OF YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS, BY CLARENCE P. SHEDD AND OTHER CONTRIBUTORS. *London, S. P. C. K., 1955; New York, Association Press, 1956. 746 pp., $6.00.*

The oldest of the world Christian organizations which today constitute the larger Ecumenical Movement, and in many respects their pioneer and forerunner, is the World's Y. M. C. A., founded in 1855. Dr. Shedd's massive and monumental chronicle of its first century adds an indispensable, invaluable and inspiring source-book to the history of the "Ecumenical Reformation" in both of its dual aspects—the world outreach of Christianity and the effort for Christian cooperation and unity.

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

THE LIVING AGE SERIES. *New York, Meridian Books, 1956.*

Among books recently received by the U. S. Q. R. have been a number of 'paperbacks'. They are part of a new trend toward providing at reasonable prices reprints of older works, often out of print, as well as occasional original contributions. Printed with care on good quality paper, these books are strongly bound between card covers. One series of theological titles for the paperback market is published by Meridian Books. The first six Living Age Books, each priced at $1.25, are:

An Interpretation of Christian Ethics, by Reinhold Niebuhr (1935)

The Mind of The Maker, by Dorothy Sayers (1941)

Christian Mysticism, by William Inge (1899)

Primitive Christianity, by Rudolph Bultmann (1956)

The Descent of The Dove, by Charles Williams with an Introduction by W. H. Auden (1939)

The Religious Situation, by Paul Tillich (1932)

Of these Professor Bultmann's study is previously unpublished although it is available in a hard cover edition, published by Thames and Hudson (London and New York) and priced at 18/-. Reginald H. Fuller is translator.

J. F. W.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

Edward T. Horn, III

The modern Christian seeking a new meaning in liturgical worship will find it in this clear historical account of the church calendar—and how it developed. The author, an outstanding scholar in this field, explains the origin and development of the special days and seasons and shows how these festivals are observed in the liturgical churches. $3.75

ARE YOU LOOKING FOR GOD?

Edmund A. Steimle

Inspirational and devotional reading in the form of 17 sermons by one of America's leading radio preachers. They reflect the sincerity of faith and warmth of personality that have skyrocketed Dr. Steimle into national prominence on "The Protestant Hour" and other leading radio and TV religious programs. $2.25

at all book stores

MUHLENBERG PRESS
PHILADELPHIA

FAITH, HOPE AND LOVE, BY EMIL BRUNNER. *Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1956. 79 pp., $1.50.*

Dr. Brunner draws upon the three facets of Christian life—faith, hope, and love—to point to the whole of the Christian faith in each. The unity in this diversity is provided by man's existence in time, past, present, and future. Man has faith in the past event of Christ, and he looks to the future with hope of a fulfillment of this faith in the ultimate realization of God's purpose. It is love, *agape*, which undergirds the present. Man is guilty about his past, uncertain about his future ,and unable to be fully in the present because of his concerns. Therefore it is in the *agape* love of God in Christ that man finds forgiveness for his guilt and security for the future in God's will. He is able to live in the present by the eradication of these two hindering concerns. It is, then, in this present activity with fellow humans that man meets God and finds love the substance of both faith and hope. "This is eternal life as experienced already in this temporal life." (p. 79)

S. H. L.

THE HYMNODY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, BY LOUIS F. BENSON. *Richmond, Va., John Knox Press, 1956. 310 pp., $4.50.*

If one could own but a single book on hymnody, the work at hand should be a leading candidate! The author, widely known as a leading hymnologist, combines solid scholarship with a fine "listening" style. I say "listening" since the book, first published in 1927, and now happily re-issued, was originally given as the Stone Lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary. This is a classic statement, and should be of particular interest to ministers, choir-leaders, and others concerned with congregational music.

R. F. B.

D. L. MUNBY

Christianity and Economic Problems

Based on the author's well-known lectures at the Union Theological Seminary, this challenging book aims to bridge the gap between the thinking of economists and theologians. Dr. Munby compares the Christian approach to social problems with the typical presuppositions of economists. He discusses today's economic problems, involving both technical and moral issues, and shows how Christian values affect the choice before us. Dr. Munby's view is international, his approach realistic and his reasoning sound. **$5.00**

At your bookstore, or from

ST MARTIN'S PRESS
103 Park Avenue, N.Y. 17

Publishers of
Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians

Errata

The following corrections should be made in the November issue of the QUARTERLY REVIEW (Vol. XII, No. 1):

Page 1: Miss Anne Booth Hale is Director of Religious Education in the Swarthmore Presbyterian Church, Swarthmore, Pa.

Page 19: (The following insertions should be made)—

too, participating in that brutal murder. "We have lifted the meataxe in the elation of love and justice." He goes on,

We have lain on the bed and devised evil in the heart.
We have stood in the sunlight and named the bad thing good and the good thing bad.

The stain of sin is spread clear across the human race.

But Warren does not end simply on this negative note. He goes on, as he says, to argue "the necessity of virtue". Our fulfillment as persons can only come as we recognize "the common lot of our kind. And that is the death of vanity, and that is the beginning of virtue."

The recognition of complicity is the beginning of innocence.
The recognition of necessity is the beginning of freedom.
The recognition of the direction of fulfillment is the death of the self.
And the death of the self is the beginning of selfhood.
All else is surrogate of hope and destitution of spirit.

So this, if it is a poem about original sin, is rather close to what . . .

Letter To The Editor

TO THE EDITOR:

May I express my appreciation for Robert McAfee Brown's article "The Minister and Contemporary Literature" in the November issue, and add a qualifying comment. His major point, if I understand him rightly, is that contemporary literature contains a lot of realistic, relevant stuff and that ministers jolly well ought to come to terms with it. Amen. He comments in an opening paragraph, "The novel must (rather) be approached as a whole, as a unit"—fearing that too many of us read fiction primarily for sermon illustrations. His point here cannot be over-emphasized. A novel or play must be dealt with in its own terms first. Only then can it be said to be "understood" well enough to extract material safely, maintaining the original significance or meaning.

But this warning applies as much to general themes as to specific incidents. Dr. Brown has extracted themes ("sin", "one's true identity" etc.) apart from their significance in the novel or play "as a whole". Referring to one play he says, "Whatever one may feel about the climax of the play, one cannot read it without feeling that here is a presentation of human beings which is done with genuine compassion and love." This thematic approach certainly makes it clear that the play is relevant to the minister's concern. What it does not make clear is that these themes do not exist by themselves, but only in relation to "the climax of the play". Until we decide whether or not the play as a whole is dramatically successful we cannot be sure precisely what kind of compassion is meant.

The minister has quite rightly been trained to make acute distinctions in theology. To navigate safely the marshy border land between theology and literature, he must make equally acute distinctions in novels and plays.

Although perhaps beyond the scope of Dr. Brown's article, this point seems to me to be important for two reasons: First, it clarifies the distinction between the Biblical point of view and the non-Christian author's view, however much may be held in common. Second, it keeps the minister from too ready answers. Conventional morality *is* too easy, as Dr. Brown points out; but so too, I fear, is *Tea and Sympathy*, despite the fact that it constitutes an honest, original statement. We *are* involved with Willy Loman; but most of us, I suggest, are involved in a tragedy beyond Willy's pathos, which knows with St. Paul that "creation itself is subject to futility", and that not even success can save us from a "dreadful reckoning".

We have been given a story to tell; a tale of Life and Death and Resurrection. There are times when we stand judged by contemporary literature, when it tells the story, or part of it, with more power and conviction than the Church tells it. The Church needs the insight and power of creative literature. But we must be ready to make clear distinctions about what is being said and what is not being said in contemporary literature as well as in theology.

Respectfully,
LEROY S. ROUNER